

UNIVERSITY OF ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE



3 1761 01886324 1





B. 216

pp
gi

omnia pro Jesu Cruci-
fixo Et Maria Dolorosa
atque St Joseph.

Ee. O. L. V. Feb. 17. 1891

-Forsan et haec alium
meminisse firabit



INTRODUCTION
TO THE
SACRED SCRIPTURES.



INTRODUCTION

TO THE

SACRED SCRIPTURES.

In Two Parts.

BY

REV. JOHN MACDEVITT, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF THE INTRODUCTION TO SCRIPTURE, ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY, ETC.
ALL HALLOWS FOREIGN MISSIONARY COLLEGE, DUBLIN.

A. F. Simard

DUBLIN:

SEALY, BRYERS & WALKER,
94, 95 & 96 MIDDLE ABBEY STREET.

BENZIGER BROTHERS,
NEW YORK, CINCINNATI, AND CHICAGO.

1889.

[All Rights Reserved]



NOV 24 1941

Nihil obstat,

THOMAS A. FINLAY, S.J.,

Censor Theologus Deputus.

Imprimatur,

✠ GULIELMUS J. WALSH,

Archiepiscopus Dublinensis,

Hiberniæ Primas.



P R E F A C E.

THE terminology of Latin has a fixed meaning, no longer subject to the changes incidental to a living tongue. Hence the unfolding of the Sacred Sciences in that language, according to the time-honoured practice of the Catholic Church, possesses advantages, so many and so obvious, that almost every Catholic work on the Introduction to Scripture is written in Latin. While, however, the Catholic Church uses in her liturgy, and legislation, the Latin tongue, which is one and the same for the Italian, and the Scandinavian, she is careful to expound her ritual and laws in the vernacular of every country. Acting in this spirit I have employed the English, a language which is now spoken by 80 or 100 millions throughout the world, in the hope that by aiding towards a wider knowledge of God's written-word, the love of Catholics for it will be deepened, and that amongst non-Catholics, earnest minds may be led to see the truth about the Bible. I feel, too, that at a time when the age is embittered with angry controversy on the *authority* of Scripture, it

is desirable to have a direct statement of Catholic teaching on this solemn question.

It is right to add, in affectionate memory of my dear brother, the late Bishop of Raphoe, that in a few places I have drawn upon notes he bequeathed to me. I am also under obligations to the lamented Dr. Dixon, who, before his elevation to the Primatial See of Armagh, filled the chair of Scripture in Maynooth, and left an enduring record of his profound Biblical erudition, in his "General Introduction to the Sacred Scriptures," published in 1852.

In conclusion, I hope this little book will help to foster tender associations in the many loving and generous hearts, who pass year after year out of these halls, away from home, to the holy work of keeping the faith active among the sons and daughters of Ireland in foreign countries.

ALL HALLOWS FOREIGN MISSIONARY COLLEGE,
DUBLIN, *Easter*, 1889.



CONTENTS.

PART I.—GENERAL INTRODUCTION—PREFACE.

CHAPTER	PAGE
I.—THE SCRIPTURE ORIGINALS.....	1
II.—VERSIONS OF THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS.....	20
III.—THE CATHOLIC CHURCH, AND ANTI-CATHOLIC SYSTEMS IN CONNECTION WITH THE BIBLE.....	44
IV.—GENUINENESS OF THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS...	58
V.—INTEGRITY OF THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS.....	75
VI.—CREDIBILITY OF THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS...	91
VII.—INSPIRATION OF THE BIBLE.....	105
VIII.—CANON OF THE SACRED SCRIPTURES.....	122
IX.—INTERPRETATION OF THE SACRED SCRIPTURES.....	144
X.—AUTHORITY OF THE LATIN VULGATE AND THE READING OF THE BIBLE IN THE VERNACULAR.....	153
XI.—THE BOOK OF GENESIS AND NATURAL SCIENCE.....	164

PART II.—SPECIAL INTRODUCTION.

THE OLD TESTAMENT BOOKS.

I.—THE PENTATEUCH.....	187
II.—HISTORICAL BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.....	195
III.—MORAL BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, AND THE PROPHETS.....	213

THE NEW TESTAMENT BOOKS.

I.—THE FOUR GOSPELS. ACTS OF THE APOSTLES. THE APOCALYPSE.....	219
II.—THE EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL.....	233
III.—THE SEVEN CATHOLIC EPISTLES.....	262



CHAPTER I.

THE SCRIPTURE ORIGINALS.

Religion—Revelation—Bible—Its original material and form—Its division into Old and New Testament—Language of the Old Testament Originals—Hebrew believed to be the primeval tongue—Jewish distribution and classification of the Old Testament—When and how the Hebrew character of the Old Testament was modified—When and how the words and sentences in the Old Testament Text were separated—How the Text of the Old Testament was arranged before the introduction of chapters and of verses—The Old Testament Originals—Their oldest copies—The Samaritan Pentateuch—Copy of Esdras—The Masora—Mishna—Gemara—Talmud—Keri—Ketib—Hebrew vowel Points—Copies of the Masora by Ben-Ascher and Ben-Nepthali—Present copies—Language of the *New Testament* Originals—Their change in form of Greek letter—The separation of their words and sentences—Ancient divisions of the New Testament—Its modern chapters and verses—Autographs of New Testament Originals—Their copies—The Codex Sinaiticus—Codex Vaticanus—Codex Aléxandrinus—Codex Ephrem, etc.

RELIGION :—Seeing that the Sacred Scriptures contain a large proportion of the truths of Religion, it is right that this Introduction should begin with a short notice of Religion and its teaching. God created man and placed him in a state of probation where he may earn for himself eternal beatitude. Hence every human being finds rooted in his rational nature a feeling of entire dependence on the Creator, a desire to propitiate Him, and a longing after blessed immortality. This solemn sense of

conscience unites man with his God, prompting and guiding him in his efforts to know Him, to love Him, and to serve Him, and it is called *Religion* from the Latin, *religo* to bind, because it constitutes a bond between the creature and his Creator.

REVELATION :—While some of the truths concerning the knowledge of God had been imprinted on the heart of man at the moment it was formed, most of them were communicated by special messengers, directly appointed to this office. They delivered part of their divine message orally, and part in writing. The first is the *unwritten* word of God or *Tradition*, being handed on by an unbroken line of supernaturally guided teachers, and the second is the *written* word, the *Sacred Scriptures*, similarly safe-guarded from above.

THE BIBLE :—The ancients, while their laws and public inscriptions were engraved on stone or other hard substance, wrote their books upon soft materials, and of these the one most in use was made from the *Papyrus* or bulrush on the banks of the Nile. The Greek for this is Βιβλος (Bible), which was ultimately applied to the Sacred Scripture, to express its superiority over all other books. The inner bark of trees, called *liber*, in Latin, was also used as a material upon which to write, and from this circumstance the word “*liber*” came to signify a book in process of time. Parchment or vellum was introduced by the King of Pergamus,

about 250 B.C. On these soft substances the writing was done by a *Calamus* or reed, dipped in a fluid like our ink. The prophet Jeremias (xxxiii. 18, 19) mentions this, and the Vulgate translates it *atramentum*, which is described to be a preparation of charcoal, gum, and water.

In Ezechiel (ii. 9), and Apocalypse (v. 1), the phrase “writing within and without” occurs, from which it would appear that both sides of the parchment were covered; but this was the exception, and one side only the rule. When a number of these leaves had been thus written upon, they were sewed together, not in pages, but one to the bottom of the other, and the end of the last fastened to a round stick, upon which the whole was wound. This is the Hebrew *megillagh*, the Latin *Volumen*, and seems to be the oldest form of book. The Jews believe that their Sacred Scripture was first written on *vellum*, and hence they have it invariably read in the Synagogue from rolls of parchment.

TESTAMENTS:—St. Paul has divided the Bible into the Old and New Διαθηκη (Covenant) because it sets forth the covenant which God made with the Jews when He constituted them His chosen people, and afterwards with Jews and Gentiles when Christ redeemed the world (2 Corinthians iii. 14, and Hebrews ix. 15). This Διαθηκη of St. Paul is translated *Testamentum* in the Latin Vulgate, and *Testament* in English.

THE OLD TESTAMENT:—In the Catholic list of Canonical Scriptures, which coming down from the Apostles, has been solemnly defined by the Council of Trent, there are forty-five books in the *Old Testament*. The first five, or Pentateuch, as they are styled in Greek, contain *the Law*, that is the divine precepts summed up in the Decalogue, and the rules regulating the morals and public worship of the chosen people of God.

LANGUAGE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT ORIGINALS:—The primeval tongue of our race was, if we are to believe Jewish tradition, the *Hebrew*. Some of the most eminent Doctors of the Christian Church endorse this belief. St. Jerome, in his commentary on Sophonias (iii. 18) says this; and St. Augustine in the *City of God* (Book xvi.) holds the language of our first parents to have been preserved from the shock of the confusion at Babel, in the family of Sem, the head of which was *Heber*. It would appear that he declined taking any part as regards the building of the Tower of Babel, and as a reward, he and his posterity were secured in the possession of man's first language, which thenceforward received the name of *Hebrew*, from this Heber, and in regular succession it came to Abraham, who conveyed it to the whole Jewish people; of whom he was the father. Hebrew is the language in which was written not only the *Pentateuch*; but every old Testament book in the Canon, except a few which

were written in Chaldaic; viz., Tobias and Judith, with nearly three chapters of the First Book of Esdras, and about an equal portion of the prophecy of Daniel. Greek was the original language of the Book of Wisdom, and of the Second Book of the Machabees.

CHANGES IN THE OLD TESTAMENT ORIGINALS:—These originals of the Old Testament in reaching us had a longer journey to accomplish than those of the New Testament; but the changes they underwent were somewhat similar both in number and in character. The Old and the New Testament consisted always of distinct parts; thus, in the former, *Genesis* was separated from *Exodus*, etc., just as in the latter the various Gospels and Epistles were separated from one another. In addition to this *natural* division the Jews distributed the books of the *Old Testament* into as many parts as there are letters in the Hebrew alphabet. How many letters, however, there were in this alphabet was a matter on which they did not agree. Not a few put forward twenty-two as the correct enumeration; but others following the triple repetition of the letter *yod* for *Jehovah*, which reverence forbade them to write, were in favour of twenty-four. Then a large body reckoned as many as twenty-seven, on the ground that the five final letters should be exclusive of the twenty-two, and thus in the Old Testament books often twenty-two; but sometimes twenty-four

or twenty-seven parts were counted. All the writings of the Old Testament were by the Jews classified under three heads, viz.: the Law, the Prophets, and *Hagiographa* or Sacred writings.

The old Hebrew letter was modified into the Chaldaic character, most probably when Esdras revised the Jewish Canon, 512 B.C. But the words, sentences, and clauses of sentences, were not properly separated until the present punctuation was adopted in the eighth or ninth century. So too the old divisions into *Parashioth*, *Haptaroth*, and *Siderim*, which set out the Hebrew books equally over the Sabbaths of the year for the purpose of Divine Service, prepared the way for our *chapters*. The division of the Vulgate into chapters was first introduced by Cardinal Hugo a Sancto Charo in 1244, and from it they were transferred into the Hebrew text by Mardochai Nathan, a learned Jewish Rabbín of the fifteenth century. Subsequently the further division into verses came into existence in 1548, and were the institution of Robert Etienne (Stephen), but they did not find their way into the Hebrew Bible until 1661, when they were marked off for the first time in a very expensive edition of the Hebrew Bible, published by Athias, a wealthy Jewish printer of Amsterdam.

THE OLD TESTAMENT ORIGINALS being perishable, did not last long; but the most ancient copy of the first five books exists in the *Samaritan*

Pentateuch. Roboam succeeded his father, Solomon, as King of Judah, in 975 B.C. By imposing heavy taxes, and enforcing their payment harshly, he drove a large body of his subjects into open rebellion, and thus was fulfilled the prophecy sent by God to Solomon, that for his sins the kingdom would be divided and given to another. Ten of the twelve tribes renounced their allegiance to Roboam, and withdrew into Samaria, where they formed themselves into the independent Kingdom of *Israel*. The secessionists brought with them a copy of the Pentateuch or *Law*, which they ascribed to Phineas, grandson of Aaron, and with this precious Scripture they set up in Samaria, a worship of their own. Jeroboam, whom they made their king, encouraged this step, in order that he might render impossible for ever the healing of the schism. He knew well that sectarian differences make those of the same race hate each other with the most bitter hatred. It happened accordingly ; so that from the moment the revolted tribes proclaimed their religious independence, a feeling of vindictive animosity sprang up between them and their brethren of Juda, which became more intensified by time. The rival system of Jewish ceremonial, thus instituted in Samaria, had a deep tinge of idolatry. A golden calf was installed there by Jeroboam, in the place of the true God, and crowds flocked to it. In vain did the prophets, under threat of the Divine wrath,

warn the people off from the unholy practice. At length, in 722 B.C., Salmanasar, King of Assyria, conquered Israel, and carried away most of the Israelites into exile at Nineveh, leaving a few to amalgamate with the Chaldaean colonists, migrated by the conqueror. From this fusion came the Samaritans, who, with their preponderating element of idolatry, combined something of the Mosaic rites.

In 530 B.C., the Kingdom of Juda was restored from its protracted captivity in Babylon. After a little time, Manasses, who discharged the duties of ministering in the Temple at Jerusalem, and brother of the High Priest then, incurred the excommunication of the Sanhedrim for obstinately persisting in his union with a Pagan wife. He at once joined the Schismatics in Samaria, and to revenge his expulsion on Orthodox Juda, he had a rival temple built on Mount Garizim, and there offered sacrifices with all the details of the Mosaic ritual. It was given out that idolatry had ceased in Samaria, and the Samaritans suddenly proclaimed themselves *the chosen people of God*, in opposition to their brethren of Juda. The mutual hatred thus aggravated was maintained for 200 years, when John Hircanus, son of the High Priest, Simeon, made a raid into Samaria, where he demolished the temple on Mount Garizim, and scattered the Samaritans, with the exception of a few, whose descendants still exist at *Nablouse*, the ancient

Shechem. This people refuse to hold any communication with the race of Juda; but they keep the Jewish pasch, and the whole of the Mosaic law, as contained in this rare copy of the Pentateuch, which they hold in great veneration. In 1616, the learned Italian, Pietro Della Valla, purchased from the Samaritans, in Damascus, a copy belonging to the tenth century, of this much-prized manuscript, and since then other copies found their way into European libraries. It is the oldest of the Hebrew originals, but, as already stated, contains only the Pentateuch. It was first printed in the Paris Polyglot, 1632.

COPY OF ESDRAS :—The entire Hebrew text has, however, come down in the Copy of Esdras, which dates from 530 B.C. Seventy years previously to this Jerusalem was taken by Nabuchodonosor, King of Babylon, and in the wreck which followed, nearly all the copies of the Jewish Scriptures, including the very autographs, supposed to have been kept in the temple, disappeared. In the troubles of the long exile that succeeded to this National calamity the sacred book of the Jews was transcribed by so many careless hands, that the *people* as soon as released, begged Esdras, “the Prince of the Doctors of the Law,” to purge it of its numerous inaccuracies. He did so by consulting the few correct copies that escaped the overthrow of Jerusalem. The whole of the text thus revised,

he wrote with his own hand, not in the old Hebrew, most probably, but in the Chaldaic character, with which the Jews were then most familiar. To enable Esdras to reproduce the text as contained in the originals that were burned, some of the ancient Fathers thought the Holy Ghost co-operated with him specially. But such *inspiration* was not needed for the work which Esdras accomplished. In the terrible conflagration which reduced the Temple and City of Jerusalem to ashes, when taken by Nabuchodonosor, every copy of the sacred book did not perish. Some eighteen years before this last blow fell upon the doomed city, a number of its most distinguished citizens were transported to Babylon. Among them was Daniel, the prophet, and it is certain that he brought with him into captivity a copy of the sacred volume, for he mentions his having consulted it:—"I Daniel understood by books, the number of the years concerning which the word of the Lord came to Jeremias, the prophet" (Daniel ix. 2). Afterwards when the total extinction of Jerusalem was effected, Jeremias, the prophet, who elected to stay and sing his lamentations over that ruin which he had so often foretold, took a last farewell of his sorrowing countrymen, as they were being banished into Babylon, by presenting them with a copy of the Scriptures:—"And, how he gave them the law that they should not forget the commandments of

the Lord " (2 Machabees ii. 2). The liberation of the Jews from their long captivity was due to the action of Cyrus, the Persian monarch and conqueror of Babylon, who had his attention called to the mention of his own name in a passage of the *Jewish Scriptures*, and this so moved him, that he at once ordered the exiles to be released (Esdras i. 1). Therefore the Jews in going into captivity, and during it, were not without copies of their Sacred Scriptures, so that these copies easily supplied Esdras with the ground work of his revision.

THE MASORA :—During succeeding centuries the copy of Esdras suffered so much at the hands of numerous transcribers, that the Jews in the fifth century of our era resolved to restore it to the state in which it came from his pen. Accordingly the services of competent scholars were employed, and that these might be stimulated to a supreme effort, they were located in two rival institutions—one at Tiberias and another at Babylon. Their labours spread over centuries, and were of the most searching character. Every word was examined with scrupulous care, and amended if necessary, according to the form, found to be duly handed down in the Synagogue from generation to generation. The Hebrew for this tradition is *Masora*, and being made the standard of correction, it gave the name *Masora* to the work itself, and *Masorets* to those engaged upon it. This body of authoritative

teaching in the Synagogue was conveyed from age to age, partly in the *Mishna* or oral law, which accompanied the written or Mosaic code, and partly in the *Gemara* or commentary of the Jewish Doctors upon the *Mishna*, both being united in one collection, called *the Talmud*. With the Jews the authority of this teaching was final, and as it transmitted the constant teaching of their highest authority, its voice commanded the most unqualified respect. Such is the character of the guide that conducted the learned Rabbins at Tiberias and Babylon through their anxious inquiry. If after patient examination they found a word to be erroneously set down, a special mark (*Ketib*) was attached, and opposite on the margin they wrote the correct word or *Keri*. In arriving at this result the process of investigation became exhaustive in the extreme, for it embraced not only words but letters, and how often the same word was repeated in different meanings, while the gaps were detected, and the missing parts supplied, as far as their traditions and other means at their command enabled them to do so. Then if the word happened to be short of a letter, or had one in excess, this was noticed, and even the defective formation or other peculiarity of any letter occupied attention. Every change, in fact, no matter how trivial, was marked, and these annotations accumulated to such dimensions that they covered both

lateral margins of the page, as well as the top and bottom. This is the great *Masora*, which, when compressed into a summary, shrunk into the small *Masora*, while the final *Masora* is merely an appendix, consisting of extracts from the great *Masora*.

Having thus fixed the correct reading, the *Masorets* determined to prevent as far as possible, the danger of any future departure from it. With this object they introduced an accent over the last word of every line, thereby laying the foundation in the Hebrew text of the present punctuation, as well as of the division into verses. Then by separating the *Hagiographa* or moral books of the old Testament into *Siderim* or *Orders*, they prepared the way for our chapters in the Hebrew Bible. But the vowel-points were the most successful plan adopted by the *Masorets* for preserving the purity of the Hebrew text. Previous to this four Hebrew consonants—Aleph, He, Vau, Yod—were made to do the work of vowels. But, how was the reader to know when these letters were to be read as consonants, and when as vowels? This difficulty was solved by the invention of Hebrew vowel-points, that is, those small particles within or about the Hebrew letters. Thus, the dot (·) within the letter א (Vau) represents the long vowel *u*, and the short vowel *e* is indicated by the three dots (∴) under the letter א (Aleph). The labours of the *Masorets* were not completed until early in the

eleventh century, when two corrected copies of the Hebrew Scriptures were published, one by Ben-Ascher, the last President of the celebrated Academy at Tiberias, and another by Ben-Nepthali, head of the rival institution at Babylon. The Eastern Jews hold fast to the revision of Ben-Nepthali, while their brethren of the West follow that of Ben-Ascher, and from both these sources all existing Hebrew manuscripts have grown into four large families—*Spanish, German, French, and Italian*. They represent the Masoretic text exclusively, and because the Spanish manuscripts are closest to it, they are pronounced the most faithful, as well as the oldest, though not one can be produced dating earlier than the ninth century.

NEW TESTAMENT :—The twenty-seven New Testament books, enumerated in the Catholic Canon were, with the exception of St. Matthew's Gospel, written in the Greek of the Colonies, which began to be established after the war of Troy in the islands of the Egean Sea, and along the coasts of Asia Minor. This colonial Greek, Alexander the Great (330 B.C.), made the language of the world, which he had conquered; but in the *New Testament*, it was diluted with Syro-Chaldaic, into which, the old Hebrew of the Jews, degenerated during their seventy years of captivity in Babylon. This New Testament Greek, however, in time began to undergo a change in the form of written character.

The ill-shaped *Uncials* or Capitals were gradually modified into the graceful *cursives* or small letters of the tenth century. And again, before A.D. 462 no separation of the text existed, into words, sentences or clauses. In that year Euthalius, an Egyptian Bishop, introduced into his edition of the New Testament, a small cross to mark off what he termed a *στιχος* or line. The larger divisions, however, had their origin in one of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, which directed that a part of the Gospels be read and explained to the people on every solemn occasion they were obliged to attend Mass. To meet this rule the Gospels had to be cast into as many *περικοποί*, as there were Sundays and holidays of obligation in the year. This plan was extended under the name of *αναγνωσματα* (lessons) to the Acts of the Apostles and Epistles in the fifth century, by the same Euthalius, who fixed the *στιχος*. To the *περικοποι* succeeded what were called after the name of their author, *Ammonian* sections. This Ammonius, an eminent Christian scholar of Alexandria in the third century, was the first to conceive a harmony of the Gospels, and in carrying it out he broke up the text into *κεφαλαια*.

Eusebius, Bishop of Cæsarea, about the beginning of the fourth century, in order to perfect the work of Ammonius, arranged the Gospel narrative under ten Canons, viz.:—The 1st contained what is common to the four Evangelists; the 2nd to St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke; the 3rd to St.

Matthew, St. Luke, and St. John; the 4th to St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. John; the 5th to St. Matthew and St. Luke; the 6th to St. Matthew and St. Mark; the 7th to St. Matthew and St. John; the 8th to St. Matthew and St. Mark; the 9th to St. Luke and St. John, and the 10th to what was peculiar to one only of the four.

Another division was into *τιτλοι* (titles), because each opened with a summary of what it contained, and thus the way had been prepared for our chapters. In 1244, as already observed, Hugo a Sancto Charo, a distinguished member of the Dominican Order in Paris, and Doctor of the University of the Sarbonne, was raised to the eminent dignity of Cardinal by Innocent IV. in recognition of his vast Scriptural learning. The fame he acquired in this department rested chiefly on his celebrated *Concordance*, based on the Vulgate. In this he grouped under the letters of the alphabet, all the more important words of the Latin Bible, and every passage in the Scripture where they occur. It was truly a formidable undertaking; but he was at last enabled to bring it to a successful issue by adopting the division of the Vulgate into chapters, and these soon found their way into the Greek Testament.

The verses were comparatively a modern institution. They appeared for the first time in an edition of the Latin Vulgate, printed in 1548 by Robert Etienne (Stephen), an enterprising publisher in

Paris. Soon after this he brought out in succession, four editions of the Greek Testament, and in the fourth he marked the verses on the margin, but Theodore Beza, Calvin's successor in Geneva, transferred them into the body of the text of his Greek Testament, published in 1565.

The originals of the New Testament which were written, as a rule, by an amanuensis on vellum, wore away very soon from continual use. These originals before they perished were extensively transcribed to satisfy the wants of the eager converts. The copies, therefore, older than the tenth century and in *Uncial* characters, must have been very numerous; still not more than about *sixty* have survived, and one only of these contains the whole of the New Testament. This is the *Codex Sinaiticus*, which was discovered at the Monastery of St. Catherine, Mt. Sinai, in 1859, by Tischendorf, famous for his skill in Oriental studies, and at his suggestion, the monks presented it to the Czar, Alexander II., who deposited the invaluable gift in the Royal Library of St. Petersburg. In 1862 by Imperial command, an *edition de luxe*, of this rare codex was printed under the editorship of Tischendorf, who in his preface tries to prove by exhaustive, but inconclusive arguments, its superiority, in point of age, over the celebrated Vatican manuscript. The *Codex Sinaiticus* is marked by Biblical critics for convenience of reference with the letter E, and B indicates the Vatican manuscript,

which is pronounced by the weight of critical opinion, to have been made in the first half of the fourth century for the Christian community of Alexandria, and is therefore the oldest existing copy of the New Testament Greek. It was added to the treasures of the Vatican Library by the illustrious Pontiff, Sixtus IV., towards the end of the fifteenth century, and, though regarded by the best authority to be the oldest, it is not the most complete, of the Greek Testament copies. The late Cardinal Mai, the most distinguished editor and critical scholar of this (and, perhaps, of any age) began to fill the *lacunæ* in the Vatican Codex, but he died while his task was progressing, in 1854. Fortunately, Father Vercellone took his vacant place, and published the work at Rome in 1857, which was also printed two years later at London and Leipzig. This, however, could not be regarded as a faithful reproduction of the Vatican manuscript, seeing that the learned editors introduced much of what was their own. It was this consideration that made the late Pope Pius IX. employ Fathers Vercellone and Cozza to superintend the Vatican Codex as it was forwarded in its entirety through the Propaganda press in 1870.

Inferior in antiquity and completeness to both the Vatican and Sinaitic Codices, is MS. A or Alexandrian, as it is called, from the circumstance of Cyril Lucar, the Patriarch of Alexandria, having presented it in 1682 to the unfortunate Charles I.

of England, and it is now in the British Museum. The first twenty-four chapters and first five verses of the twenty-fifth chapter of St. Matthew's Gospel, together with some of St. John's Gospel, and the second Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, have dropped out. So far it is defective, while in the matter of age it is fixed by Montfaucon in the first half of the fifth century.

The Codex, C, or Ephrem in the Imperial Library at Paris, is chiefly remarkable for its being one of the best specimens of *Palimpsest*, that is parchment or other similar material, from which one writing had been rubbed out to make room for another. In the present instance the original Greek text was removed for the works of St. Ephrem, the Syrian. The erasure, however, was imperfect, so that the first writing, *i.e.*, the text of the New Testament, re-appeared under the skilful hand of Tischendorf, who had copies of it printed at Leipzig in 1843. It contains some fragments only of the New Testament, and is believed to belong to the beginning of the fifth century.

There are two Codices under the letter D, one in the Library of Cambridge University, and the other in the Royal Library at Paris. Both were the gift of Theodore Beza, who found the second in the Monastery of Clermont in France. It has only the Epistles, and is not as old as the first, which is ascribed to the fifth century, and contains the Gospels and Acts of the Apostles.



CHAPTER II.

VERSIONS OF THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT.

ANCIENT VERSIONS:—Greek Septuagint Version of the Old Testament—Its origin, age, and name—Story of a miraculous intervention in favour of the Septuagint—Christians have always treated the Septuagint with reverence—The Jews gave up their religious veneration for the Septuagint in end of the first century—Origen's celebrated Hexaplarian revision of the Septuagint—This followed in the Alexandrian Codex—Septuagint revision by St. Lucian, the Martyr—This praised by St. Jerome, and it has survived in the Vatican Codex—From it Sixtus V. (1587) took the best edition of the Septuagint that has ever been printed—The Greek of the Septuagint not pure, and its literalness varies—The Septuagint from the time of its first appearance contained the translation of every book in the Jewish Canon—The Septuagint the best witness to the state of the Old Testament originals—The Targums or Chaldaic Versions—The *Complutensian*, *Royal*, *Paris*, and *London* Polyglot Bibles—The Peshito or Syriac Version—The Samaritan Version—The Coptic Version—The Gothic Version—Slavonic Version—Among the earliest Latin Versions the *Vetus Italica* (old *Italic*) held the first place—Its New Testament part, as corrected by St. Jerome in 382, is retained in the present Latin Vulgate—The Old Testament part of the Vulgate is directly translated from the originals by St. Jerome, except in the Psalms, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, the two Books of Machabees, Baruch with its Epistle of Jeremias, and fragments of Esther and Daniel—The Old Testament Vulgate does not throw much light on the state of the Hebrew and Chaldaic originals—The New Testament Vulgate is the highest existing authority, except the Peshito, on the state of the Greek originals—Latin Catholic Versions of the Scriptures from the sixteenth century down—Latin Protestant Versions of the Scriptures from the sixteenth century down—Catholic Versions of the Bible in modern languages—Catholic Version in Irish—The Douay Bible—Protestant Versions of the Bible in modern languages—Protestant Version in Irish—Protestant Versions in English—Tyndal's Version—The Geneva, or Breeches Bible—The Bishop's Bible—The Authorized Version—Its recent revision.

ANCIENT VERSIONS.

THE SEPTUAGINT VERSION :—Nearly 300 years before Christ the Old Testament Hebrew was translated into Greek under the high sanction of the Jewish Sanhedrim, or Supreme Council of Seventy-two, whence the term, *Septuagint*, has been derived. On the death of Alexander the Great the vast dominions he had won by the sword were divided amongst his four favourite generals. One of them, Laomedon, obtained Palestine and Syria; but in a short time he was expelled by another, who became King of Egypt. This was Ptolemy Lagus, who, in his victorious progress against Laomedon, captured many prisoners of Jewish nationality, and carried them away into Egypt. These adopted with such readiness the Greek language and Greek customs, which prevailed in the land of their exile, that they came to be called *Hellenist* Jews like their countrymen, who had settled among the Greek colonies after the dissolution of the Babylonish captivity. Owing to the fecundity of their race they formed so large a body in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus, who succeeded his father, Ptolemy Lagus, in 288 B.C., that he deemed it his duty to have their Sacred Scriptures translated into the language of their adoption. This he accordingly did, and the result having been endorsed by the local *Sanhedrim*, or Jewish Council of Seventy-two, the *Septuagint*

derived its name and authority from this circumstance.

There is a tradition among the Jews that this remarkable Version was made by six of the best Hebrew scholars, taken from each of the twelve tribes. They were, it is said, sent by the High Priest from Jerusalem, at the request of Ptolemy Philadelphus, to Alexandria, where they accomplished their task under the direct influence of a heavenly light. On their arrival at one of the royal residences on the island of Pharos, they are represented by Philo, a Jewish historian of the first century, by St. Justin the Martyr, and St. Epiphanius, to have been put into either seventy-two or thirty-six apartments, so separated as to render communication with each other impossible. After an interval of seventy-two days in their guarded seclusion, the learned company, without a single exception, announced the close of their anxious labours, and on meeting together to compare notes, they were startled to find amongst all an agreement even to the very letter. But, this story of a miraculous intervention in favour of the *Septuagint* is not believed as a rule, and, therefore, the notion, based upon it, of its authors being divinely assisted, which seems to have been accepted by St. Augustine among the Latin Fathers, by St. Irenæus, St. Justin the Martyr, and others among the Greek Fathers, has long since been given up.

That a special providence of God, however, watched over its origin and progress there can be no doubt. Hebrew was then so little known that the prophecies pointing to the coming of the Messiah in the near future could not become generally known unless through the medium of a Greek version of the Old Testament Books. It is to be observed that our Blessed Lord and the Apostles commonly appealed to the *Septuagint* when addressing the people, and the earliest defenders of the faith drew from it their most crushing arguments. Indeed no sooner had the invincible Roman legions planted their rule and language on the ruins of the great Macedonian empire, than the foremost of the numerous Latin translations (the *Vetus Itala*) was taken word for word from the *Septuagint*. Surely, then, it is not too much to expect that the finger of God should be recognised in this Version by Christians generally, and Catholics in particular, in every age.

The Jews themselves regarded the *Septuagint* with religious veneration, for Philo Judæus, their learned historian at Alexandria, describes, in his "Life of Moses," the enthusiastic demonstration made by his countrymen in honour of the *Septuagint* every year in the island of Pharos. He wrote in the first century, but not long after this, the object of their joy was turned into a source of mourning. The *Septuagint* contained those passages from the Pro-

phets, which pointed unmistakably to Jesus as the promised Messiah. The Jews, therefore, denounced the Septuagint as a gross misrepresentation of the originals. They even went so far as to declare its existence the greatest calamity that befel their nation, and to atone for this they ordered the Hebrew text to be read for the future in the Synagogues, and the anniversary of the issue of the Septuagint to be kept as a day of Jewish fasting and repentance. They hoped that among the strenuous advocates of the Christian religion there was not even one sufficiently skilled in the knowledge of Hebrew to be able to detect their imputation on the Septuagint. But their hopes were not realized. Their malice was soon exposed, and by none more ably than Origen in his celebrated dialogue with Tryphon, the Jew. This timely publication of their guilt was a triumphant proof of how the Jews appreciated and feared the high character of the Septuagint, for they would never have adopted such foul means to destroy its reputation, if it had been always under their ban.

— The eminent position which the *Septuagint* thus occupied among Jews and Christians caused it to be transcribed extensively. It was to rid the Septuagint text of the differences between it and its many copies, as well as to prove the genuineness of its prophetic passages, which sustained the truth of the Christian arguments, that Origen

compared it with the oldest copies of the Hebrew originals. The result was a work of gigantic proportions in fifty volumes, which for twenty-eight years severely taxed Origen's intellectual and physical powers. In six parallel columns (εξαπλούς) he placed first the Hebrew text, then a transcript of that text in Greek characters, followed by the Septuagint text itself, and the Greek Versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion. By the aid of these standards of correction, to which he added in the course of the work, three anonymous Greek Versions, thus bringing up the number of columns to nine (εννεαπλά), the common text of the Septuagint was most rigidly revised. In some places, links from the Hebrew originals had been found missing, and these Origen supplied in the *Septuagint*, mostly from the Greek Version of Theodotion, by writing them over where they ought to be, with an asterisk. But any word or words not to be found in the Hebrew and in the Septuagint was simply indicated there by an obelisk. The result Origen enriched with most exhaustive marginal notes, explaining the Hebrew names, as well as the different readings in the Samaritan, Hebrew, and Syriac manuscripts. This is the celebrated *Hexapla*, which was deposited in the library of Cæsarea, and there copied by the learned Bishop and historian, Eusebius, with the assistance of one of his priests, the accomplished Pamphilius, who

afterwards won the Martyr's crown. This copy was all of the *Hexapla* that escaped the flames when Cæsarea was burned in 653 by the Saracens. Even it, as a whole, has been lost; but the fragments have been collected and printed by the celebrated Montfaucon in 2 vols., fol., Paris, 1784.

A much more perfect revision of the *Septuagint* than this of Origen, was one made by St. Lucian, a priest of Antioch, who suffered martyrdom in A.D. 311. St. Jerome gives his opinion to this effect very freely in his letter to Suria and Fretela, and in this he is joined by modern critics. This excellent revision has survived in the Vatican Codex or MS. B., from which the best edition of the *Septuagint* was printed in 1587 at Rome. This is the *Sixtine* edition, so called because it was executed at the expense, and with the approbation of Pope Sixtus V., who engaged the services of the most able Biblical scholars. The *Septuagint* which has come down in the Alexandrian Codex, or MS. A., follows closely the *Hexapla* of Origen, and upon it Grabbe, a distinguished Oxford professor, based his printed edition in 1720.

The Greek of the *Septuagint* is not at all pure. It is, like that of the New Testament, colonial Greek, and it is also diluted with some Coptic words in Greek dress, which show its Egyptian origin. Then the first five books, or the Pentateuch, are a very faithful translation; but in the rest its literalness varies a

good deal. From this circumstance some infer that Ptolemy Philadelphus had only the Pentateuch translated. But this surmise is not of much account, since the author of the Greek translation of Ecclesiasticus states in his preface, that when he began his work every other book in the Jewish Canon was already in Greek, and he lived in the reign of Ptolemy Evergetes, the immediate successor of Ptolemy Philadelphus. As a witness, however, to the state of the Old Testament originals the Septuagint Version is incomparably the best. It can give evidence of how the Hebrew text stood nearly 300 years before the Christian era, while no existing Hebrew manuscript is older than the ninth century.

THE TARGUMS:—The next best witness in this respect is furnished by the *Targums*, that is the Chaldaic Versions, which became necessary for the Jews, after they had lost the original Hebrew tongue, and adopted the Chaldee in the Babylonish captivity. Eleven or twelve of these *Targums* are known to Biblical scholars, who give the first place to that of *Onkelos*. This favourite Targum has been printed with some few others of inferior authority in the *Polyglot Bibles*, which owe their institution to the illustrious Cardinal Ximenes, Archbishop of Toledo in Spain, and founder of the University of Alcala De Henares. It was in 1502 he conceived the idea of the *Complutensian* Polyglot, so called from *Complutum*, the Latin name for Alcala De Henares,

and having surrounded himself with the most ancient manuscripts, and assisted by the best talent to be found for the purpose, he watched and directed its progress for fifteen years. The total expenditure incurred in this noble undertaking amounted to nearly £40,000. It was published in 1517, and contains, together with the Hebrew text, the Septuagint Greek, and the Chaldee, each with a literal Latin translation, as well as the text of the Latin Vulgate. This splendid conception, and still more splendid result, sprang from a genuine love of sacred learning, and evoked the admiration of the literary and religious world. It roused others to a still greater effort in the same direction, for in the year 1569 Christopher Plantin, the proprietor of a fine printing establishment in Antwerp, resolved to bring out a Polyglot Bible on a much more extensive scale than the Complutensian. He wrote to his sovereign, Philip II. of Spain, for patronage and support. The king not only responded with a munificent donation, but sent the learned Spaniard Benedict Arias Montanus to preside over the editorial staff. The work, therefore, received the title of *Royal*, and was published in 1572 in eight folio volumes. It has the Hebrew, the Greek, the Targum of Onkelos, the other Chaldaic paraphrases, and the Latin Vulgate in the Old Testament, together with the Greek, Latin, and a Syriac version, printed both in Syriac and Hebrew characters in the New Testa-

ment. Nearly a hundred years passed, leaving the Royal Polyglot without a rival, when a distinguished Orientalist, and profound Biblical student, Gui Michel Le Jay, determined to gratify his tastes by devoting his large fortune and extensive learning to produce, what he called, the *Paris Polyglot*. It appeared in 1645 in ten folio volumes, containing everything in the Royal Polyglot, and in addition, another Syriac Version and an Arabic Version, together with the Samaritan Version, and the Samaritan Pentateuch, each accompanied with a literal translation. The last but not the least of the four great Polyglot Bibles was edited by Brian Walton, the learned Bishop of Chester. It is called the London Polyglot because it was published at London in 1645, and contains a good part of the Bible in nine languages, viz.:—Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Samaritan, Chaldaic, Syriac, Arabic, Ethiopian and Persian.

THE SAMARITAN VERSION:—The third place among the Witnesses to the state of the Hebrew originals is accorded to the Samaritan Version. It belongs to the first century of the Christian era, and is a literal translation of the *Samaritan Pentateuch*, which has been fully noticed. Next is the famous Syriac Version *Peshito*. It is taken literally from the Septuagint in the Old and from the Greek originals in the New Testament, and is marked thus:—"This translation was finished in the year

of the Greeks, 389, by the hand of Achæus, the Apostle." According to this inscription St. Thaddæus or Jude, who evangelized Syria, was the author of this translation, which certainly goes back to his time. Such is the tradition of the Syrians themselves, and it is borne out by the arguments of Cardinal Wiseman in his *Horæ Syriacæ*. The Apocalypse and four of the Epistles are wanting in it, because their canonical authority was not commonly known, or universally acknowledged at the time this version was made. A splendid edition of it was printed at Vienna in 1555 with the assistance of a distinguished Maronite priest, who had visited Rome with the object of presenting to the Chair of Peter in the person of Julius III. the allegiance of the Maronite Christians.

THE COPTIC VERSION :—St. Anthony was a young man, living in affluent circumstances in Upper Egypt, when he determined to leave all and go among the Anchorites in the desert, where he became the founder of Monasticism. The resolution came to him one Sunday at Mass from hearing this pointed text read in the Gospel of the day :—"If thou wilt be perfect, go sell what thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven, and come, follow me" (Matt. xix. 21). Now, these words must have been read in Coptic, for it is recorded of St. Anthony, by his biographer, Paccomius, that he

knew no other language. This occurred in the year 270, so that the Egyptian Version of the Bible must have been in use long before that time. It is therefore among the oldest of the ancient versions, and one of the most reliable, for in the Old Testament it is a faithful rendering of the Septuagint, while the New Testament part is a direct and scrupulous translation of the originals. The *Ethiopian* and *Armenian* versions, which are set down to the beginning of the fifth century, are also taken from the Septuagint and New Testament originals, and a beautiful edition of the latter has been printed in 1816 in the Armenian Convent at Venice.

THE GOTHIC VERSION :—Back in that early period, when the waves of migration from distant Asia inundated Europe, the *Goths* came and settled on the Danube. Here they expanded into Ostrogoths and Visigoths, so powerful as to tax all the resources of Constantine, the Great, to annex them to his empire. Soon after their conversion to Christianity, Uphilas, one of their bishops, in turning the whole Bible into their native tongue, produced a scrupulous rendering of the original Greek of the New and of the Septuagint in the Old Testament. Time has also made inroads upon it, which have been repaired by the famous Cardinal Mai, who discovered many of the missing parts in the library at Milan. The four Gospels of this version, in tolerable preservation, and called

the *silver manuscript*, because written in silver letters, are still preserved in the library of Upsal in Sweden.

THE SLAVONIC VERSION:—The Slavs, like the Goths, in the wandering of the human race from its home in remote Asia, settled in the North of Europe, where they became the founders of the Russian people. In the ninth century this powerful nation was converted to Christianity by the preaching of Saints Cyril and Methodius, two brothers, who were invited thither by the King of Bulgaria. These holy missionaries, to render the work in which they were engaged abiding and fruitful, translated into the *Slavonic* tongue, the Old Testament from the Septuagint and the New Testament from its original Greek. It is greatly admired for its fidelity and has been often printed.

THE LATIN VULGATE:—At the outset of Christianity, Rome ruled a vast empire in the East and West. The Greek, which had been diffused first by colonization from Greece, and then by the victories of Alexander the Great, lingered for a time among the conquered races. Soon, however, the knowledge of Greek began to fade, and then arose the need of a translation of the Scriptures into the language of the Roman conquerors. A large number of Latin translations came forth, and among them there was one, made from the Septuagint in the Old and from the Greek originals in the New Testament, which

St. Augustine pointed out as the favourite, because “to perspicuity it joined a more literal rendering of the words.” He speaks of it, in his book on Christian Doctrine, as *Itala* or *Italica*, because in common use throughout the Italian Churches. It is generally believed to have been a revision of a very superior one, mentioned by Tertullian (180) as existing in Africa in his time, and made there shortly before, probably not by one person, but by many. Its fame spread to Italy, where it was revised, and continued to gain in popularity year after year, and St. Gregory the Great, in A.D. 600, mentions it as the *Vetus Italica*.

St. Jerome came of noble family, in Dalmatia, in 331, and because of his great thirst for learning, he was sent by his father to Rome, that he might have the benefit of the best masters in Latin, Rhetoric, and Philosophy. While yet young, he felt disgusted with the pleasures of Roman society, and being received into the Christian Church, he resolved to retire from the world, and devote himself exclusively to the study of the Scriptures. With this object he buried himself, about 374, in the burning desert of Chalcis, in Syria, where he spent four years pursuing his favourite studies, living a life of great austerity. In this desert, under the tuition of another recluse, converted from Judaism, St. Jerome acquired a knowledge of Hebrew and Chaldaic, which he afterwards perfected at

Bethlehem by similar assistance. His solitude was so invaded in 379 that he left; received priest's orders in Antioch, and then went on to Constantinople, where he spent three years in mastering the Greek language, enjoying at the same time the society of St. Gregory Nazianzen. Happening to come to Rome in 382 on a mission, connected with the Miletian Schism, he was received with much attention by the learned Pope, Damasus, who made him his secretary and read the Scriptures with him. After some experience of St. Jerome's profound Scriptural learning, the Holy Father begged him to undertake what he, the Pope, had long at heart, and what was then sorely needed by the Church, namely, to purge the *old Italic* of those defects, which began in the translation, and increased in the copying. Thus, the Sovereign Pontiff would be in a position to secure uniformity of quotation from the Gospels, on the part of those engaged in championing the faith against the Arians. This wish of the Vicar of Christ St. Jerome regarded as a command. In a comparatively short time he corrected the Gospels in the old *Itala* by comparing them with the Greek originals, and in a dedication to the Pope, he says : "I have corrected those words *only* which seem to "affect the sense of the originals, and let the others "stand, that the Latin text to which the people are "accustomed might not be altered too much."

The Pope was so pleased with this result, that St. Jerome, to gratify him still more, revised the whole of the New Testament in the old Latin Version on the same plan as set forth in his dedication above quoted. Turning his attention then to the Psalms in the *Vetus Itala* he corrected them according to the *κωνη* or St. Lucian's common edition of the Septuagint. This is the Roman Psalter, because made for the use of the clergy in Rome at the Pontiff's request. It was, however, done hastily, so that on returning to his hermitage at Bethlehem, upon the death of Pope Damasus, St. Jerome at once set to work and produced the best revision he could of the Latin Psalter by collating it with Origen's Hexapla. This is now what is in the Vulgate, and it is called the Gallican Psalter, from the fact of its having been introduced into Gaul by St. Gregory, of Tours.

In the rest of the Old Testament, as St. Jerome did not consider the Latin Version before him, that is the old Italic, remarkable for its accuracy, he put it aside, and beginning with the Kings, made a direct translation into Latin of all the Proto-canonical books in the Old Testament from their Hebrew originals, which was duly published with his famous Helmet preface (*Prologus galeatus*). He did the same in reference to the Chaldaic originals of Judith and Tobias, as well as the Chaldaic parts of Esdras

and Daniel, but his translation of the Deutero-Canonical portions of Esther was from the Greek of the Septuagint, and of the Deutero-Canonical portions of Daniel from the Greek of Theodotion. Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, the two books of Machabees, the Prophecy of Baruch, with its united Epistle of Jeremias, he did not touch, so that their Latin text in the Vulgate is that of the old Italic Version. The outcome of these labours was the *Latin Vulgate*, which is truly a noble monument of the perfection with which St. Jerome mastered the original languages of the Bible. Still, the Church in the beginning was very slow to adopt it, lest the novelty might offend the faithful who were accustomed to the words of the *Vetus Italica*. Little by little, however, this timidity disappeared until the *Vulgate* took possession of the whole field, vacated by the old Latin Version.

As a translation, the Old Testament part of the *Vulgate* was a marvellous performance on the part of St. Jerome. It does not, however, throw much light on the state of the Hebrew originals, for the copies of these from which St. Jerome made his Latin translation could not go back very far. Much higher in this matter of critical value is the character of the New Testament *Vulgate*, because the *Vetus Italica* (old Latin) has been retained there, and Dr. Westcott, an eminent Protestant authority, says :—
“ This translation was fixed and current more than

“a century before the transcription of the oldest Greek manuscript. Thus it is a witness to a text more ancient and, *ceteris paribus*, more valuable than is represented by any other authority, unless the *Peshito* in its present form be excepted.” This old Latin text was corrected by St. Jerome in producing his New Testament Vulgate, by consulting Greek copies, dating not only beyond the fourth century, when he lived, but beyond any manuscript of the Greek Testament at present existing, seeing that not one has been found older than, and two only as old as, the fourth century.

In the sixteenth century, and later, some Catholics, skilled in the ancient languages of the Scripture, produced a few *Latin* Versions of the Old and New Testaments, from the Hebrew, Chaldaic, and Greek originals. This was done in regard to the whole Bible, in 1527, by Sanctes Pagninus, head of the Vatican Library. His work was revised in 1572 by Arias Montanus, a learned Spaniard, and its faithfulness secured for it a place in the London Polyglot. Then followed at intervals Father Houbigant’s Latin translation of the Old Testament, side by side with his Hebrew text; Father Weite-
nauer’s Old and New Testament in Latin, and in the same language the New Testament alone, which its author, the celebrated Erasmus, dedicated to Pope Leo X. During the same time, Protestants, eminent for their oriental learning, turned either the

Old or the New Testament, or both, into Latin from the Hebrew, Chaldaic, and Greek. These men proudly boasted of adhering strictly to the ancient text, while in reality they made the originals bend to their own sectarian views. Such was the Latin Version of the Old Testament by Sebastian Munster, in 1534, and still more that of Leo Juda, a prominent Zuinglian, in 1543. Two years after the latter appeared, Vatable, a distinguished Hebrew scholar, enriched it with notes of great critical value, and with these it was brought out as a second edition by Etienne, (Stephen) of Paris. In 1789, Professor Dathe, of Leipzie, published a Latin translation of the Old Testament originals, and so did Junius and Tremellius at an earlier date. Both are in favour with Protestants, but not to the same extent as the Latin Version of the New Testament by Theodore Beza, who became spiritual head of the Calvinists on the death of their founder. He has, however, notoriously perverted the sense of the original Greek, to season his Latin for the Calvinistic palate.

VERSIONS OF THE BIBLE IN MODERN LANGUAGES:—
For about a hundred years before the Reformation, German Catholics had the Bible more than once translated into their own language. Their Bishops at present recommend the German Version of Allioli, which is very faithfully rendered word for word from the Latin Vulgate and is furnished with

very fine explanatory notes. It appeared in 1830. So too in French there are many Catholic versions, dating so far back as 1294; but the latest and best is that published with excellent notes in 1861, by the Abbé Glaire, who has faithfully rendered the text of the Latin Vulgate. In Italy, of all the Catholic Versions, the one that holds the highest place was translated literally from the Vulgate, in 1779, by Anthony Martini, Archbishop of Florence, who has also added valuable notes. The Spanish Catholics have a favourite Version on the same plan, by Don Felipe de San Miguel, published in 1793, and the Portuguese one by Antonio Pereira, which appeared in 1781, while the Belgian or Dutch Catholics have the Version of Nicholas Van Winghe, printed in Louvain so early as 1548. In short, there is no Catholic country without its native Version of the Scriptures, approved and circulated by Episcopal authority. In the sweet and expressive language of holy Ireland there is a Catholic Bible, as old as 1347, which emanated, as is supposed, from the pen of Richard Fitz-Ralph, Archbishop of Armagh. Dr. MacHale, the late Archbishop of Tuam, was actually engaged in correcting the old Irish translation according to the Latin Vulgate; but failing health prevented the completion of the undertaking. English-speaking Catholics all use the *Douay Bible*. It is an English translation, made directly from the Vulgate, in the

English College at Rheims, in France, about 1582 ; but as the Old Testament part was not published until 1610, in the English College at Douay, the whole has got the name of the *Douay Bible*. Dr. Challoner, Catholic Bishop of London, revised it in 1750, and the Catholic hierarchy of Ireland soon circulated it amongst their flocks. The Catholic Bishops of America adopted it in 1810, and Scrivener, the learned Protestant editor, in his supplement to the *Authorized Protestant Version*, says that “*the Douay translation is highly commendable for its scrupulous accuracy and fidelity.*”

Protestants, as soon as they parted from the rock of Peter, initiated their grand doctrine of every man being his own teacher in religion, by turning the Scriptures into every modern language, from secondary and adulterated sources like the Latin of Theodore Beza, and not scrupulously, as they pretended, from the originals. Thus, Luther, in his famous German Bible of 1532, shows but a very imperfect knowledge of Hebrew and Greek, though he boasts of having drawn straight from these fountains. In 1629, Dr. Bedell, Protestant Bishop of Kilmore and Ardagh, had the Old Testament translated into Irish by a Mr. King, who knew little or nothing of the original languages, with which it is stated to have been compared by Bedell himself ; but in some places only. The New Testament of this Irish Protestant Bible had been

previously produced by a Protestant Archbishop of Tuam, Dr. William Daniel. In French, the Protestant Version most in repute is by Beausobre, printed in 1718, and in Italian, the one by Diodati is bitterly flavoured with Protestantism. The apostate, William Tyndale, in 1526, became the author of the first Version in *English* of the New, and part only of the Old Testament. It was, however, full of wilful corruptions, and these were well exposed at the time by Sir Thomas More, the learned Chancellor of England. The whole Bible in English, by Miles Coverdale, Protestant Bishop of Exeter, was printed in 1535; but is considered inferior to Tyndale's effort. Then came the well-known *Geneva* or *Breeches Bible*, which was the joint production of Gilby, Whittingham, perhaps John Knox, and other prominent divines of the Puritan stamp, who, when the Catholic, Queen Mary, came to the throne of England, fled to the more congenial atmosphere of their Calvinistic centre in Switzerland. It is saturated with Swiss Protestantism, and derives its most familiar name from the rendering it gives of Genesis iii. 7, to this effect:—"Then the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked, and they sewed fig-tree leaves together, and made themselves *breeches*." *The Bishop's Bible*, brought out in 1568, got its title from being the work of eight Protestant Bishops, who, with the assistance of other scholars, executed their com-

mission by command of Queen Elizabeth, and under the superintendence of Matthew Parker, Archbishop of Canterbury. *The Authorized Version* is the one which has been acknowledged in the Church of England for more than the last two centuries and a half. When King James I. ascended the Throne of England, an address was presented to his Majesty by the clergy of Lincoln diocese, who declared among other things, that “the English Versions in common use were absurd and senseless, perverting in many places the sense of the Holy Ghost.” In consequence of this and other such representations, the King ordered fifty-four of the most eminent divines from Oxford and Cambridge to produce a new Version of the Hebrew and Greek Testaments. Four years were devoted to the task, and the outcome was the present *Authorized Protestant Version*, which received the Royal sanction in 1605. It is the Version appointed by the Crown to be used in all the Churches belonging to the English communion, so that no Anglican clergyman can use any other in public worship. From it alone, and in conformity with it, is taken the formidable array of Scripture Versions, issued in almost all the different languages and dialects of the world, by the Biblical Societies in England. This Authorised Version, after the long interval of over 260 years, was lately revised by a learned company, under the presidency of Dr. Ellicott, Protestant Bishop of

Gloucester and Bristol. These distinguished scholars devoted ten years to their arduous work, and some of their corrections, like the few mentioned in another chapter, are in harmony with the Catholic Vulgate.





CHAPTER III.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND ANTI-CATHOLIC SYSTEMS. IN CONNECTION WITH THE BIBLE.

Christ constituted His Church *Catholic*—*Infallibility* of the Catholic Church—St. Peter's personal *infallibility*—St. Peter's *primacy of honour and jurisdiction*—These prerogatives of St. Peter passed by divine institution to the Bishop of Rome, and hence the Catholic Church has been always called *Roman*—The commission of teaching His whole Church *infallibly*, with which Christ invested the other Apostles descended to their successors, the Bishops of the Catholic Church in their corporate capacity—That the Pope, when speaking *ex-Cathedra* has the power of teaching *infallibly*, was *explicitly* defined in the Vatican Council—Old Catholics—Definitions like the *personal infallibility* of the Pope, when teaching *ex-Cathedra* do not constitute additions to the faith—Protestants—Deism—Materialism—Rationalism—The vicious teaching of Strauss, author of the *Leben Jesu* (Life of Jesus)—The Essays and Reviews—The *Ecce Homo*, or “a Survey of the life and works of Jesus Christ.”

THIS is the place to give an account of the Catholic Church, because, soon after Christianity was established, she began that splendid struggle for the character of the Bible, which has since been maintained by her against the heretics, who ventured to attack it. This persistent defence of the authority of the Sacred Scriptures on part of the Catholic Church has been challenged in later times by Luther and his followers, so that *Protestantism* and

the various systems that have grown out of it for the past 300 years, demand also some notice in these pages.

CATHOLIC CHURCH :—Christ not only left on earth a body of revealed doctrine, which He required men to believe, but also the means of communicating the knowledge of these saving truths throughout all nations. Therefore, Jesus selected from amongst His immediate disciples some who were to act as teachers, that is the Apostles, whose divinely authorised mission was to continue in their lawful successors until the end of the world. This is recorded by St. Matthew in his Gospel (xxviii. 18, 19, 20):—
“And Jesus coming spoke to them saying: All
“power is given to me in heaven and in earth. Going
“therefore teach ye all nations: baptizing them in
“the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the
“Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things
“whatsoever I have commanded you: and behold I
“am with you all days, even to the consummation of
“the world.” Thus Jesus constituted His Church *Catholic* in extent by placing all nations under its sway, and *Catholic* in doctrine by determining “all things whatsoever I have commanded you” to be the subject of her teaching, and *Catholic* as to *time* by His promise that she would last for ever, “even to the consummation of the world.”

INFALLIBILITY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH :—In order that men might feel certain that the faith

taught by Christ, had been transmitted to them in all its purity, those divinely chosen teachers should be protected by God from error. Hence the Apostles and their successors “for ever” received authority from Christ not only to teach His doctrines, but to decide controversies regarding their true meaning, and to do so infallibly:—“And I will “ask the Father, that He may abide with you for “ever. The Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot “receive, because it seeth him not, nor knoweth “him; but you shall know him, because he shall “abide with you, and shall be in you. I will not “leave you orphans. . . . But the Paraclete “the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my “name, he will teach you all things, and bring all “things to your mind, whatsoever I shall have said “to you” (Gospel of St. John xiv. 16-26).

PERSONAL INFALLIBILITY OF ST. PETER:—And again, “from among the Apostles themselves, one has been chosen,” says St. Jerome, “that a head being appointed, the occasion of schism might be taken away.” This was done when our Blessed Lord conferred upon St. Peter *personally* and *independently* the authority of *infallible* teaching, which He had just given to all the Apostles *dependently on* and *subordinately to* St. Peter. At the last Supper Jesus singled out St. Peter from the other Apostles, and addressed him thus:—“Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have

“you that he may sift you as wheat. But I have “prayed for thee that thy faith fail not : and thou “being once converted, confirm thy brethren” (Gospel of St. Luke xxii. 31, 32). St. Peter was thus made personally infallible in his teaching as head of the Church, for if he himself were capable of erring, he could not confirm his brethren.

The fact that our Blessed Lord gave St. Peter, personally and independently, the power of teaching infallibly, is the foundation of what was always held in the Catholic Church as her general and approved teaching. It is that when the Pope, who is the Bishop of Rome, and consequently St. Peter’s successor, publishes any decree in the matter of faith and morals to which he requires submission from all the faithful, that is when teaching *ex-Cathedra*, he is infallible in such decrees. This doctrine, though dragged into controversy, so far back as the fifteenth century, was not solemnly defined until 1870 in the Vatican Council. It was then assailed with the utmost virulence by Non-Catholics, and in Germany a few, who called themselves *Old Catholics*, were condemned as heretics for having stubbornly repudiated it, on the grounds that by its promulgation the faith of the Church had been changed. But, in defining this dogma, it is not true to say that the Vatican Council added to what was taught by Christ. The Catholic Church,

in her teaching office, whether through an Ecumenical Council, or through the Roman Pontiff, speaking as head of the Church, cannot define any truth unless it be contained in the revealed Word of God, communicated to men by Christ and His Apostles. Her authority, as infallible teacher, is restricted to the faith, confided to her safe-keeping by Christ Himself, and she has no power to add to or take from this divine deposit. Definitions like that of the infallibility of the Pope, and the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin, do not constitute additions to the faith. They propose, for the belief of the faithful only, such of those revealed doctrines as have been controverted.

ST. PETER'S PRIMACY OF HONOUR AND JURISDICTION :—Again at Cæsarea-Philippi where Jesus came after the multiplication of the loaves and fishes, He asked the Apostles whom did they believe him to be? St. Peter answered for them :—"Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God." This glorious profession of faith Jesus met at once by an assurance that it did not proceed from flesh and blood, but from divine revelation, and He proceeded to declare its reward, namely, *the primacy of honour*, in these words :—"Thou art Peter ; and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it" (Gospel of St. Matt. xvi. 16-18). Then continuing to address St. Peter

alone, Jesus added :—" And I will give to you the
"keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever
"thou shalt bind upon earth, shall be bound also in
"heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it
"shall be loosed also in heaven" (Matt. xvi. 19).
Now, the keys are the emblem of jurisdiction, from
which it follows that Christ gave to St. Peter,
whom He had appointed head of His Church *the
primacy of jurisdiction*.

This primacy of jurisdiction was confirmed afterwards when Jesus commissioned St. Peter to feed His lambs and sheep, that is, to govern the whole flock—pastors as well as people. (St. John xxi. 15, 16, 17.) And this double primacy of *honour and jurisdiction* should be transmitted to St. Peter's successors, because it could not otherwise serve the end intended by our Blessed Lord. So too the authority of teaching infallibly, which was conferred upon St. Peter *personally and independently*, must pass to the Bishops of Rome, seeing that it was given to make fast the principle of unity in doctrine, and, therefore, to continue as long as the Church of Christ should last, and this is the reason why the *Catholic Church* has been always called *Roman*. It was in Rome that St. Peter established his See, and died there after presiding over it for a quarter of a century. It was from this centre he exercised his primacy, and since then, every Bishop of Rome, as St. Peter's legitimate successor, governed the Universal or

Catholic Church of Christ, as its Sovereign or Supreme Pontiff.

In the same way the commission of teaching the whole Church infallibly with which Christ invested the other Apostles *dependently* on and *subordinately* to St. Peter, descended to their successors, the Bishops of the Catholic Church in their corporate capacity. Christ promised that He would be with "them to the consummation of the world," and that the Paraclete "would abide with them for ever." By this divine assistance the whole body of the Catholic Episcopate, united with the Roman Pontiff, are protected against every error when teaching the faithful in matters connected with faith and morals.

PROTESTANTS:—Christ not only established in the Church a body whose office it is to teach infallibly and to govern, but He required obedience to their authority. In sending His seventy-two disciples, "two and two before His face," into the harvest, He said to them:—"He that heareth you, "heareth me ; and he that despiseth you, despiseth "me ; and he that despiseth me, despiseth Him that "sent me" (Luke x. 16.) And St. Paul in his Epistle to the Hebrews (xiii. 17) enjoins upon that people to "obey your prelates, and be subject to "them, for they watch as having to render an "account of your souls ; that they may do this "with joy and not with grief." For over 1,500

years this obedience was, with some few exceptions, dutifully accorded to the legitimate successor of St. Peter at Rome, and to the lawful successors of the other Apostles throughout the world. In the middle of the sixteenth century, however, some in Germany first, then in Switzerland, England, and other countries, contended that this ancient *infallible* and living authority to teach the true Christian faith had failed, and with a *protest* they went out from its jurisdiction. Since then they are known as *Protestants*, which is a general term for those who profess Christianity, but belong to one of the sects that sprang from the rebellion of the sixteenth century.

DEISM:—Protestants having thus emancipated themselves from the infallible authority which Christ had established in His Church, set up in its stead the shifting rule of private judgment. Starting from this fundamental principle of Protestantism, John Locke, a graduate of Oxford, published about the year 1666, after nineteen years' study, his "Essay on the Human Understanding." In it, he investigated the source of all truth, and arrived at the conclusion that the mind of man is a "*tabula rasa*" before receiving knowledge, which it imbibes in every branch, through the five senses, that is from experience. This is the doctrine of *Sensism* or *Empiricism*, which Toland, the disciple of Locke, and master of the English infidel school, applied to

the principal truths of Christianity. He insisted that since the doctrines of the Christian faith are derived, not from the testimony of the senses, but from supernatural revelation, they must be set aside. He accordingly rejected them, and the *Natural Religion* or *Deism*, which he put in their place, made faith consist merely in the belief of God, and His truths, so far as they are discoverable by the contemplation of the external world, or Nature.

MATERIALISM :—*Deism*, however, did not make a deep impression on the English mind, but transferred to France, it was warmly adopted by Voltaire, who had resolved to devote his whole life to the effort of destroying Christianity, and with it all positive religion. His most active agents were D'Alembert and Diderot, by whom the Deism or Naturalism, imported from England, was soon developed into *Materialism*. Matter, they taught, is the efficient and supreme cause of all things. It is self-existing and self-directing without a God to sustain or govern it. Man's soul, being but a part of his body, dies with it, so that there is no future state of reward or punishment; no distinction between moral good or evil; no divine faith; no Church; no sacred ministry. Such were the theories circulated throughout France in the columns of the infamous *Encyclopedi*.

RATIONALISM :—It was in this way the English

Deists and French *Materialists* sensualized religion, but it remained for the German philosophers of the last hundred years to *Rationalize* it. They hold that truth of whatever description must not be accepted on any authority, no matter how high, unless it be demonstrated by the reason of the rational man. The senses assure every human being that there exists an external world. No one has even been able to doubt it, but *Rationalism* rejects the testimony of the senses. The dictate of inward consciousness commands one to believe that he exists when he is conscious that he exists, and so forth. But Rationalists pronounce this dictate to be a chimera. Then Revelation proclaims that there are in God three Divine Persons really distinct, that the second Person assumed human nature, and so on with the other mysteries of the Christian faith. But the Rationalist repudiates this evidence. There is, he contends, no supernatural order.

IDEALISM :—The Idealist accounts for religion on the principle which makes all knowledge come to man from ideas. But an *idea* cannot testify to the truth of what it represents, so that the existence of the objects must be ascertained from other authority. If they belong to the physical world, they are known by the senses; should they be a part of the spiritual world—primary or original notions—the dictate of inward consciousness proclaims them, and positive revelation does the same

with the truths of the Christian faith. The advocates of *Idealism*, however, hold that nothing is true except what is assured on the evidence of *ideas*. This startling theory was systematized in his "Critik of Pure Reason," published in 1781, by Emanuel Kant, who taught Logic and Metaphysics in the University of Königsburg, his native city. There are, he said, in the mind categorical ideas, or certain necessary unchangeable forms, and it is upon their evidence alone the existence of ideas and their objects must be accepted. How, he was asked, can these categories, which are only ideas, furnish the knowledge of objects? And his answer was that they belong to the sphere of practical and not theoretical reason. But practical reason is simply a practical judgment of reason, which is a matter of positive faith without strict evidence, and it is upon its authority Kant tells us to take all the knowledge of external objects. This, he says, is the source of that true religion, which is to be found in the dictates of practical reason and not in the dogmas of revelation.

Such was the origin of *Idealism*, by which the evidence of ideas was constituted the only criterion of truth. But, Kant made the object really distinct from reason or the mind apprehending it, and this could not hold long. The theory was repudiated by Fichtè, a friend of Kant, and Professor of Philosophy in the University of Jena about 1792,

to make way for his own notion that there is no real distinction between the ideas and their objects. He maintained that the mind apprehending was the bearer of every true existence, and that the objects outside were merely its manifestations or modifications. Hence, the thinking mind is the one true real existence, in which everything is identified; the objects or what is spoken of as endowed with real existences are mere appearances or phenomena, so that when the mind attributes to them a distinct existence it is in a dream. Therefore, in identifying the mind, apprehending, with the object, Fichtè was forced to reduce external objects, that is, bodies and intelligent beings, to mere appearances, and so strip them of real existence. This evidently was an error, much more fatal to Idealism than the one he ventured to remedy in the system of his friend, Kant. It was at once perceived by the keen vision of F. W. Schelling, a distinguished professor in Berlin, who followed Fichtè's lectures at Jena, and was an enthusiastic student of *Idealism*. He saw that so long as the objects were confined to the thinking mind only, their existence was purely *ideal* and not *real*. They were therefore removed by him from the thinking mind, or subjective-self to the absolute-self, but what this absolute-self was he did not explain in a manner intelligible to ordinary readers. He said it was the great absolute Being in which all diversities and oppositions as of ideal

and real, subject and object are confounded, and out of which they grow. This Great Being is the one sole existence, or God, according to Schelling, while Hegel, who succeeded him as leader of the German philosophical school, declared the one sole existence to be the idea itself which he styled *the great all*.

These German philosophers summoned before the tribunal of their reason the truths of the Bible, hitherto held sacred and certain by the whole Christian world, and condemned them as unworthy of belief, since they were beyond the region of ideas. They were, they said, either inventions of the writers, or historically true but superstitions, which Jesus, who was only a man, and His immediate followers embodied in their own religion to make it acceptable to the Jews, and the miracles put forward in confirmation of these superstitions were the result of natural causes. Others went further and declared the Christian truths, as well as the miracles, with which they were sealed, to be mere *myths*. These views found the strongest expression in the lectures of F. Baur, who expounded divinity in the University of Tubingen about 1826. Here one of his most assiduous pupils was David Strauss, who published his "Leben Jesu" (Life of Jesus), in 1835, and a revised edition for the German people in 1864. In it he put forth this proposition:—"A personality which on one side indeed is of a man, but on the other is a Being born of a human

“mother, is begotten of no human father, such an object we hand over to fable and to poetry, but never think of making it the theme of serious historical statement.” It was this book that suggested to Ernest Renan, once a student of the great Ecclesiastical Seminary of S. Sulpice, at Paris, his own “Vie de Jesus,” in which he modified the myths of Strauss into legends. He is now the recognised apostle in France of the doctrines which Strauss propagated in Germany.

Though the vicious teaching of Dr. Strauss had not a popular following in England, still many works having a rationalistic tendency have come from the pens of some prominent members of the English Universities, within recent years. Thus in 1860 appeared the “Essays and Reviews,” edited by the Professor of Greek at Oxford, and in 1868 Macmillan and Co. brought out the “Ecce Homo, a Survey of the Life and Works of Jesus Christ,” which was accepted at the time, by the public generally, as the work of an eminent Oxford Professor. No doubt Protestants, as a body, repudiate with horror these monstrous systems of modern philosophy, and shrink from any association with them. But, nevertheless, they proceed on exactly the same rule as that upon which Protestantism set out, namely, private judgment in the interpretation of the Bible.



CHAPTER IV.

GENUINENESS OF THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS.

Definition of New Testament genuineness—The genuineness of all the books of Scripture on the Catholic Canon, intimated but not defined by Council of Trent—The Christian Church, from time of the Apostles, believed the New Testament books to be genuine—External evidence of this belief—Not necessary that the witnesses testifying to this belief should be all contemporary—God would not allow the faithful to be mistaken in this belief—This belief not challenged by enemies of Christian Religion—This uniform belief of the whole Church not to be rejected because one or two of the early Christian writers are found quoting from spurious Scripture—Impossible to have imposed fraudulently upon the faithful the New Testament Scriptures—Internal evidence for genuineness of New Testament—Arguments of some German freethinkers, from internal evidence, against the genuineness of the *Synoptics* or three first Gospels, as well as the fourth Gospel—Genuineness of Old Testament—Proved by external and internal evidence—Arguments of the German and English Rationalistic Schools against the genuineness of the Pentateuch.

GENUINENESS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT:—When the writers are specified, as in the case of the New Testament, the genuineness of its books consists in this, that they have been written by the persons whose names they bear. This fact has been intimated, but not defined by the Council of Trent. The Tridentine Fathers, in their IVth Session, proclaimed, by solemn decree, the Scriptures, one by one, which constitute the Catholic Canon, and

in doing so they significantly entered the name of the writer after each book.

That the Christian Church, from the time of the Apostles, believed the genuineness of the New Testament is conclusively proved by *external evidence*, that is the testimony of the early Christian writers, as well as by *internal evidence*, or qualities that distinguish the character of the New Testament writings.

EXTERNAL EVIDENCE:—As regards the external evidence, perhaps, the very best proof of the belief of the primitive Church in this matter is contained in those ancient liturgies, mentioned in the “Apostolic Constitutions,” attributed by some to the Apostles themselves, and quoted by Benedict XIV., in his work on the Sacrifice of the Mass. Here it is commanded that a part of the New Testament be read and explained at the Mass or Synaxis; but this ordinance cannot be accounted for unless the New Testament was believed to be a *genuine* book by the early Christians. Next there are many individual witnesses to the same fact. St. Clement, of Rome, who enjoyed the confidence of St. Paul, and was third in succession in the Chair of Peter, furnishes splendid testimony of this belief in the Christian Church when he lived.’ In order to reform the sensual and divided Christian community at Corinth, he admonishes them by letter:—“To remember the Epistles of the blessed Paul the

“Apostle, which he wrote to you in the very
“beginning of the Gospel. Truly in the Holy
“Ghost he sent letters to you anent himself, Cephas
“and Apollo, because even you were split into
“factions.” St. Clement here states that St. Paul
was the writer of the Epistles to the Corinthians in
the New Testament.

St. Polycarp, as well as St. Ignatius, the Martyr,
were disciples of St. John the Evangelist, and they
are still more pronounced than St. Clement of
Rome, in their testimony. St. Polycarp, who was
Bishop of Smyrna, wrote to the Philippians :—“To
“rise with Christ by keeping His Commandments,”
and accompanied his exhortation with the following
important declaration :—These things I write to you
“in justice, because you incited me, for neither I
“nor any other like me can attain to the wisdom of
“the blessed and glorious Paul, into whose Epistles
“if you look you may raise your spiritual fabric by
“strengthening faith, which is our mother, hope
“following and charity towards God and our neigh-
“bour preceding us. He who has charity is far
“from all sin.” The arguments with which this
remarkable document abounds are supported by
passages from Matthew, Mark, and Luke, with the
well-known formula “the Sacred Scriptures,”
implying, of course, that they were taken from the
Gospels.

Among the seven Epistles of St. Ignatius, the

Martyr, there is one to the Philadelphians, where he speaks of the whole New Testament in the language of the time as *Gospels* and *Apostles*. At Chapter v. he says :—" But your prayer with God will make
" me perfect, that I may attain the portion which
" His mercy assigns me, flying to the *Gospel* as to
" Christ present in body, and to the *Apostles* as to
" the real living priesthood of the Church."

Therefore, St. Clement of Rome, St. Polycarp, and St. Ignatius, who were on terms of the closest relationship with the writers, implicitly declare that the Christian Church in the time of the Apostles regarded the books of the New Testament as genuine.

This evidence of Christian belief, coming from the time of the Apostles, is carried down in an unbroken chain, by those who lived immediately afterwards. Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia, about 140 A.D., left the following statement :—
" Mark, the disciple of St. Peter, wrote faithfully
" from memory what he learned of the acts and
" sayings of the Lord, but not in the order in which
" they happened. Matthew wrote in Hebrew the
" divine oracles." Eusebius, who recorded these words of Papias in his Ecclesiastical History, added :—" Moreover, the same Papias has given
" extracts from the first Epistle of St. John and
" the first Epistle of St. Peter."

Hermas wrote *the Pastor* some time between

141 and 157 A.D., when his brother, Pius I., was Bishop of Rome, and in it he has quoted largely from St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke and St. John; from the Acts of the Apostles; the Epistles of St. Paul to the Romans and Ephesians, and from the first Epistle of St. Peter. But to do this would be, indeed, utterly futile on his part, unless the source, from which he has drawn so abundantly, was commonly regarded as *genuine*.

St. Justin the Martyr, an eminent Platonic philosopher, embraced the true faith with great fervour, in his native Samaria, and came to Rome. Here he addressed to the Emperor, Antoninus Pius, his famous *Apology*, in which he advocated the cause of the Christians with such force, that the persecution, then directed against them, was arrested. In this appeal he mentions the Gospels, and says they were written by the Apostles. A part of his treatise on the Resurrection is given by the learned Grabbe in his *Miscellanies of the Fathers of the second century* (page 177), and it contains long extracts from the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke, and from the Acts of the Apostles.

St. Irenaeus after his conversion in Asia Minor also visited Rome, and there vigorously assailed the errors of the Gnostic heresy in the last quarter of the second century. In his third book against these errors, he furnished splendid testimony to the

genuineness of the New Testament. At chapter i. he declares that "The way of salvation was made known to us by those who announced the Gospel, and afterwards embodied it in writing. . . . Matthew it was who, among the Hebrews, brought out in their own language a written Gospel when Peter and Paul were preaching in Rome, and founding the Church. Then after their departure, Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter: he too delivered to us in writing what Peter preached. And Luke, moreover the follower of Paul, set down in a book the Gospel preached by Paul. Then John, the disciple of the Lord, who also lay on His breast, John too published his Gospel, living at that time at Ephesus in Asia." And at chapters xii. and xv., he gives long extracts from the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles of St. Paul.

The testimony of this period is well supported by the fragment of a Canon of the New Testament books, discovered by the celebrated antiquary, Muratori, about the year 1700, while in charge of the great Ambrosian library in Milan. This fragment begins with a broken sentence, which is followed by these words:—"In the third place is the book of the Gospel according to St. Luke; the fourth, the Gospel of St. John." It may be fairly concluded that the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark occupied the first and second places on

the list. This fragment also mentions the two first Epistles of St. Peter and St. John, the Acts of the Apostles, and all the Epistles of St. Paul, except the one to the Hebrews, and contains an important statement to the effect that the book called "*the Pastor*, by Hermas," was written "quite lately, in our own time, while Pius, the "brother of Hermas, was filling the Episcopal chair "in Rome." Now Pius I. died in A.D. 157, so that the date of this fragment is fixed at furthest in the year 175 or 180.

In the third century, Origen, in his homily on the 7th Chapter of Josue, after explaining the mystical signification of the fall of Jericho, speaks explicitly of every book of the New Testament:—"The priests," he says, "destroyed Jericho by the "blast of their trumpets, etc., etc., but our Lord "Jesus Christ, when He came, sent priests also, "viz., His Apostles, with trumpets to preach His "heavenly doctrines. Matthew in the first place "blew his trumpet, by writing his Gospel, and "Mark, Luke and John followed. Peter also by "his two Epistles, and James and Jude. Lastly "also, he who said, 'For I think that God hath set "forth us Apostles' (1 Cor. iv. 9), and by the blast "of his fourteen Epistles he scattered to the winds "all the machinations of idolatry, and the various "systems of philosophy."

In this century too, Tertullian, after his conver-

sion in 202 A.D. at Carthage, where he was the ornament of the Bar, employed his splendid talents in combating the rising heresies. His most powerful defence of the Catholic faith was made in four books against Marcion, an apostate, who, among other blasphemies, denied the Incarnation of our Lord, as well as the resurrection of the body, and to support his views, rejected the Old and New Testaments, except a few Epistles, and the Gospel of St. Luke, which he tried to corrupt. Tertullian in his refutation mentions all the books of the New Testament, giving the writer's name in every single instance.

Against most of these witnesses it may be urged that they were not contemporary with the New Testament writers. But when there is question of documents which were public property, and as such well-known to all the Christian congregations; contemporary evidence is not necessary to establish their genuineness. It must be remembered too that there was here a strong supernatural element, for God would not allow the faithful to be deceived in reference to the genuineness of a book that contained doctrines they were bound to know and believe in order to be saved. Then if this belief of the Christian community could have been challenged, the founders of heresy in those times would have done so in order to get rid of the doctrines of the New Testament,

which they denied. Celsus, a Pagan philosopher, attacked the doctrines of the New Testament about the middle of the second century, but did not question its *genuineness*. Neither did Porphyrius, another Pagan philosopher, in the third century, nor the Emperor Julian, the Apostate, and thus some of the most determined foes of the early Christian Church join in bearing testimony to the *genuineness* of the New Testament books.

It is true that there was quite a number of forged Gospels, Acts and Apocalypses in existence during the first centuries of the Church. Some of these spurious Scriptures may have been accepted as genuine by one or two of the early Christian writers. But the unfounded impression of a few, and for a brief period, is not the uniform belief of the whole Church, upon which the genuineness of the Scripture rests. Then it would be impossible at any time to palm upon the public the New Testament writings. The Apostles would have denounced any such attempt in their day, and, in after times, the pastors of the Church would have warned their flocks against receiving them. Tertullian, in his book on Baptism (chap. ix.), relates a fact which shows how sharply the Bishops of his day visited any attempt to pass off fictitious Scriptures. He says that an African priest, a contemporary of his own, published some treatises on devout life, under the name of an Apostle. The

act was merely a pious fraud, and yet when it came to the knowledge of his bishop, the offender was suspended from his office and benefice. And when the heretic Marcion tried to circulate a false gospel of St. Luke, Tertullian it was who exposed the rash attempt.

INTERNAL EVIDENCE :—The internal evidence for the genuineness of the New Testament may be given in a few lines. The actions and doctrines of our Lord are there stated with such accuracy and minuteness, that the writers must have been present, or had them immediately from personal witnesses. Now, St. Matthew and St. John wrote only what they themselves heard and saw, while St. Luke, St. Mark, and St. Paul, had what they have stated from the testimony of eye-witnesses.

The first three Gospels are commonly called *Synoptics*, because each gives a collective view of our Blessed Lord's teaching and acts. Upon this circumstance, as well as the remarkable resemblance between these books, some few German Free-thinkers build a fanciful theory to the effect that the Gospels of St. Matthew, St. Mark and St. Luke are merely editions of one popular Scripture, published in the beginning of the Christian Church to silence the Jewish converts, who were clamouring for the right of retaining the Mosaic ritual in the New Dispensation. From the same quarter the

force of internal evidence is also directed against the authorship of the fourth Gospel. This book, they say, with its strong flavour of Gnosticism, is so sublime in sense, and so finished in style, that it could not possibly be the work of an illiterate fisherman of Galilee; but of some accomplished scholar and profound thinker, belonging to the Gnostics of the second century.

The three first books of the New Testament, however, are singularly alike, inasmuch as they go over the same ground, and not from any connection with a document, which no early Christian writer mentions, and never existed except in imagination. As to St. John being incapable from his antecedents of producing the fourth Gospel, it is enough to observe that he was "the disciple whom Jesus loved" (John xxi. 7), and thus received from his Divine Master that heavenly light which enabled him to rise to the height of his lofty production.

GENUINENESS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT:—Coming now to the Old Testament, some of its books, as for instance, Judges, Ruth, the four books of Kings, the two books of Paralipomenon or Chronicles, Judith, Esther and Job, are not signed by the writers; but their genuineness consists in this, that they are the work of persons, who lived near the time and were well acquainted with what they have recorded. This fact, together with that of all the other Old Testament books, having been written by

the persons whose names are affixed to them, is proved by external and internal evidence.

EXTERNAL EVIDENCE :—The witnesses who supply the external evidence, are the Jews themselves, and surely their testimony cannot be questioned. The Old Testament contained the doctrines and laws that controlled the supreme spiritual, as well as temporal, interests of the Jews, and consequently their authority as to its genuineness is final, like that of the early Christian community in reference to the genuineness of the New Testament. Now the Jews always and everywhere paid the most profound religious respect to the canon or list of their sacred books. It was kept in the side of the ark (Deuteronomy xxxi. 26), and the Jewish monarch was bound to have a copy before him and “read it all the days of his life” (Deuteronomy xvii. 19). When the Feast of Tabernacles—one of the three great annual festivals of the Jews—returned, the sacred volume was solemnly produced, and read aloud before the multitude. This persistent reverence of the Jews for the Old Testament is the best proof of their belief in its genuineness, for they would have been glad of the slightest grounds to reject it altogether, since, giving as it did, prominently the account of their sins, it was a standing monument of their shocking ingratitude to God.

Then the Jewish historian, Josephus, in his book

against Apion, mentions the consistent and universal tradition of his countrymen regarding their Sacred Scripture to be in significant accord with that of the Christian Church from the time of the Apostles. This uninterrupted belief of both Jews and Christians insists that while those Old Testament books, which begin with Josue and end in the second of Machabees, were compiled by competent men from records, made at the time by official Scribes, and kept with religious care, while the first five books were written by Moses, partly from personal experience, and partly from historical monuments, as well as information, obtained through the long lives of the six preceding generations. This belief also held that Moses, born about 1600 B.C. in Egypt, the great prophet, legislator and liberator of the Israelites, wrote these five books between the years 1490 and 1450 B.C., an interval which he spent in nomadic journeyings through the desert, at the head of his countrymen, who had been miraculously delivered from their Egyptian bondage. After this period of long and dreary wandering, his pusillanimity at the last moment, and his disobedience to the letter of the Divine command, displeased God, who condemned him to die within a short distance of that "Promised Land;" for which he had so long sighed. This sad scene closed one of the most eventful and important lives in the Old Testament. The oldest and most



reliable Pagan historians bear the same testimony. Thus Manetho in Egypt, Strabo in Greece, Diodorus, the Sicilian, and Tacitus, the Roman, speak of Moses by name in their allusions to the sacred book of the Jews.

INTERNAL EVIDENCE :—The Old Testament possesses also internal marks, which place beyond all reasonable doubt the fact of its genuineness. For instance, the way in which the institution of the Divine worship and civil polity of the Jewish nation is narrated in the Pentateuch, points unmistakably to Moses as the writer. All the details are described, and this could be done only by one, who, like Moses, had been actually engaged in the proceedings. Thus there is an account of every timber, decoration, and measurement in the plan, sketched by the Divine Architect for the Tabernacle or portable temple. It was to be of square formation, thirty cubits long, ten high, and ten broad. Its walls of “settim-wood” to be overlaid with gold, and resting on blocks of solid silver. The interior to consist of a sanctuary, twenty cubits by ten, and of “a holy of holies,” ten cubits square. In this “holy of holies” the ark was to rest, having within the ten commandments, engraved on two tables of stone, and without, on the roof, a rich throne for the *Shekinah* or symbol of God’s presence, under a golden canopy of winged cherubim. The great candlestick, and the incense-altar, supporting a golden bowl, filled with sacred

fire, were to occupy the outer sanctuary. Then the laws given by God for the religious and civil government of His "chosen people" are set forth with such exactness, that they were evidently dictated to the writer, and such was Moses. So, too, in Josue, Judges, Kings, etc., the intimate acquaintance, with everything related therein, is so striking as to render it impossible for any one to have written these books except some person, who had been closely connected, both by time and knowledge, with the events.

Still, the enemies of God's written word seek to set aside the genuineness of all the Old Testament books by directing their shafts principally against the Pentateuch and its author. Vater, De Wette, and Colenso, representing, respectively, the Rationalistic schools of Germany and England, make out the Pentateuch to be a tissue of tales traditional, touching the boasted beginnings of the Jewish nation. These legends, they say, came to be woven into popular ballads, which were collected, and written out in their present form by different persons, during the long interval between the establishment of the Hebrew monarchy (1090 B.C.) and the end of the Babylonish captivity (530 B.C.) In support of this, it is assumed that because, throughout the first five books of the Old Testament, God is variously termed *Elohim* and *Jehovah*, there must be corresponding *Jehovistic* and *Elohistic*

authors. For a similar reason it is taken for granted that one and the same writer could neither have called *Genesis* "the generations of the heaven and the earth" in one place (ii. 4), and in another (v. 1), "the book of the generation of Adam," nor *Leviticus*, "the law of holocaust," in chapter vii. 37, and "the law touching the leprosy of any woollen or linen garment," in chapter xiii., and 59th verse. The want of similarity in the diction of the Pentateuch, as well as those remarkable gaps, like that from the third to the fortieth year in the nomad life of the Israelites, demand, they say, a plurality of writers. Besides, Moses could neither be the author of the last chapter in *Deuteronomy*, where his own death is described, nor of those passages, such as *Exodus* (xvi. 35), in which it is stated that the Israelites had arrived on the borders of Chanaan. But the tribes of Reuben and Manasses did obtain a footing in the "promised land" before their great legislator departed this life, and the circumstances of his death are given by the faithful Josue in the closing chapter of *Deuteronomy*. That there would be an occasional void in the story of the Pentateuch, and a variety of language, is what must be expected from one like Moses, who had to do his work during forty years, in the midst of great hardships up and down the wilderness. As to *Jehovah* it corresponds with *Almighty, All-wise*. The word

designates God in all His omnipotence and wisdom, etc.; but *Elohim* is the Hebrew for the Supreme Being without His attributes; and with regard to the different titles in Genesis and Leviticus, they are merely the headings of those parts into which the subject is divided.





CHAPTER V.

INTEGRITY OF THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS.

Substantial integrity of Scripture Text—Church teaches that God safe-guarded this integrity—Many Rationalists hold it to have been essentially altered by number and nature of changes which it underwent—That these changes touched the letter only and not the substance, proved by exhaustive labours of Biblical critics—Triumphant support to Catholic teaching by this textual investigation—Classification of Greek Testament manuscript copies into families—the highest critical authority belongs to the Alexandrian family—Rules of Biblical criticism for fixing correct reading of any disputed passage in the Bible—Printed editions of Old Testament Hebrew Text, and of New Testament Greek Text.

SUBSTANTIAL INTEGRITY :—The Bible is one of the channels, adopted by God to transmit the precepts, which the faithful must observe, the doctrines they are to accept, and the miracles, confirming this divine code of laws and belief. This collection of precepts, doctrines, and facts, constitute the *substance*, which in the Old and New Testaments God has confided to the safe-keeping of a divinely-appointed guardian. Hence, Catholics hold that the Bible text has not suffered essential variation.

Against this Catholic teaching many Rationalists allege the changes to which the original Scripture text was subjected from the beginning. Of these

wearing influences, transcribing, they say, was perhaps, the most injurious because, in reference to the New Testament especially, as soon as it appeared, every congregation sought a copy, and so did many rich converts. Under this urgency copies multiplied to meet the pressing demand. In making these the transcribers had often to deal with letters so imperfectly formed that the keenest sight could not identify them. For this reason, and also from similarity of sound, if the work were done from dictation, whole words have been misapprehended. The skill of the transcriber was more severely taxed when he encountered words written into each other in one undivided line without punctuation or separation of any kind, as was often the case. It also happened that marginal notes found their way into the body of the text. The various readings were largely increased under this action, and so continued at every stage of copying through which the manuscripts passed until printing was invented. Then the original text of the Bible was extensively quoted, as well as printed, so that this, together with the turning of it into languages, different from those in which it was composed, that is Versions, have changed it materially. Such is the anti-Catholic argument, taken from the variations, that mark every stage of the Old and New Testament text.

BIBLICAL CRITICISM :—But these differences have been critically examined, and found in every instance to touch the *letter* and not the *substance*. It has been described how Origen in the second century produced his celebrated Hexapla, in which he corrected the Septuagint by comparing it with the oldest copies of the Hebrew originals, and other existing Greek versions. Nearly a hundred years afterwards, Lucian, a priest of Antioch, and Hesychius, an Egyptian Bishop, effected a similar revision, and St. Jerome, in 388, at the request of Pope Damasus, corrected the old Latin version or *Vetus Italica*, which was then somewhat defective. This Biblical criticism has been pursued with special activity for the last 200 years and more, not alone by distinguished Catholic talent, but by some of the ripest scholars in this department on the Protestant side. Benjamin Kennicott, a Fellow of Oxford, in 1750, explored the state of Van-der Hooght's Hebrew text of the Old Testament, by comparing it with upwards of 600 Hebrew copies and sixteen manuscripts of the Samaritan Pentateuch. With the assistance of other accomplished Orientalists he worked from ten to fourteen hours a day for ten years, when his health broke down under the strain.

The world was filled with the praises of Kennicott's labours, when De Rossi appeared upon the same field, and performed still greater wonders. He was a Catholic priest, occupying a chair in the

University of Parma, and by far the best authority of his day on the ancient languages of the Bible. With this profound knowledge he applied himself to fix the correct reading of the Hebrew text, and in doing so no less than 751 copies of the original passed through his hands, besides some Samaritan manuscripts and ancient versions. All these were collated, and the variations, as well as his own critical remarks, filled five volumes, of which Davidson speaks in the following complimentary terms :—" This immense collection was made with " marvellous industry and singular care by one who " displayed a better judgment than Kennicott in " such matters." (" Biblical Criticism," p. 225.) The result of this highly finished examination and comparison has made it certain that the Masoretic, the only Hebrew text now existing, is substantially correct. This is only what could be expected, seeing how careful the Jews always were of preserving the purity of their sacred writings, as has been abundantly proved by the history, already given, of the labours of Esdras and the Masorets.

The Greek text of the *New Testament* has been also closely examined by distinguished experts. On the Protestant side, Griesbach (1796), is pronounced to be " the most consummate critic that ever undertook an edition of the New Testament," and yet in our own day he has been surpassed by Tischendorf (1841-1873), who is said to have " crowned the

edifice" of New Testament criticism. At great expense of time, and after much patient study, he inspected every manuscript copy, version and fragment of the Greek text, to be found in all countries, and from these he reaped a rich harvest of materials for the purposes of correction. The multitude of various readings, thus collected, he set forth in order, with an account of the sources from which they were drawn, and this is the *Apparatus criticus* with which his own emended text was fortified. But like spots upon the sun, the virus of his religious principles obscures the brilliancy of his critical faculty. For instance, in the fifth verse of the ninth chapter from the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans—"Whose are the father, and of whom "is Christ according to the flesh: who is over all "things, God blessed for ever, Amen." Tischendorf has arbitrarily inserted a full stop between "things" and "God," in order to strengthen the views held by the Socinians, who deny the divinity of our Lord. With the same object he has dropped out of his text the well-known seventh verse, in defence of the doctrine of the Trinity, from the fifth chapter of St. John's first Epistle:—"And there "are three who give testimony in heaven, the "Father, the Word and the Holy Ghost. And these three are one." Thus bigotry has shattered one of the finest monument of critical scholarship.

Among the Catholic scholars, who devoted them-

selves to the criticism of the New Testament a high place is occupied by Dr. Scholz, Professor in the University of Bonn, about 1830. During twelve years he visited all the libraries of the world, and discovered sources hitherto unknown, for helping to arrive at the original reading.

The thorough nature of this textual investigation of the Bible, and its triumph to the Catholic Church has been eloquently described by the late Cardinal Wiseman:—"But in all their mass," he says, "although every attainable source has been exhausted; although the writings of Fathers of every age have been gleaned for their readings; although the versions of every nation, Arabic, Syrian, Coptic, Armenian, and Ethiopian have been ransacked for their renderings; although manuscripts of every age from the sixteenth upwards to the third, and of every country, have been again and again visited by industrious savants to rifle them of their treasures; although having exhausted the stores of the West, critics have travelled like naturalists into distant lands to discover new specimens, have visited, like Scholz or Sebastiani, the recesses of Mount Athos, or the unexplored libraries of the Egyptian and Syrian deserts—yet has nothing been discovered—no, not one single various reading which can throw doubt upon any passage before considered certain, or decisive in favour of

“any important doctrine.” (Lecture x. on Science and Revealed Religion, p. 145). And at page 354, “We must feel great satisfaction at the small difference between the best and the most inferior manuscripts, and consequently at the consoling manner in which the integrity of the inspired records has been preserved.” Therefore the grand fact stands out that the stream of time and use which is continually corroding the fabrics of other writings, passes by the imperishable text of the Scriptures without inflicting *material* injury.

At the same time it must be admitted that there were a few distinguished Catholic theologians of good reputation in the 16th century, who characterized the Hebrew text as tainted even in essentials. This happened when the champions of the “Reformation” attacked the reputation of the Latin Vulgate. They flaunted before the public gaze a number of passages in the Old Testament where the Vulgate differed merely in form from the Hebrew. Melchior Canus (Book ii., Chapter xii., de locis theologicis), and Salmeron (in Prolegomeno iv° in Evangelia), met this charge by a declaration to the effect that the Jews wilfully and unscrupulously falsified the Hebrew text, to set aside the arguments taken from it in support of the Christian religion. No doubt this motive had an influence for evil on the Jews, but never to the extent of mutilating or interpolating what they held most

sacred, namely, the Hebrew text. It drove them to pervert the true meaning of some of the ancient prophecies in Greek versions of their own, made purposely to set aside the authority of the Septuagint, which was adverse to their system. This was the crime which called forth the erudition of Origen, and evoked St. Jerome's, St. Justin's, and St. Chrysostom's scathing denunciation.

THE RULES FOR DETERMINING THE TRUE READING OF ANY DISPUTED PASSAGE IN THE BIBLE:—These great labours of Biblical critics have done more than prove the truth of the Catholic teaching that God has safeguarded the substantial integrity of the Bible; they have furnished an effectual means of discovering those non-essential variations, which made their way into the Scripture text on account of the vicissitudes through which it passed, as well as of determining the true reading of any disputed passage in either the Old or New Testament. For instance, in Matthew (xxvi. 26), the Latin of the Vulgate translated faithfully into English is:—"Jesus took bread, and blessed, and broke: and gave to his disciples, and said: take ye and eat; this is my body," which literally shows that what was merely bread in coming into the hands of Jesus, passed through an entire change into His real body, as soon as "He blessed, broke, and gave it to His disciples." But in the authorized Protestant version the particle "it" occurs after *blessed, broke, and*

gave :—" Jesus took bread and blessed *it*, and broke "*it*, and gave *it* to His disciples, and said, Take, eat, "this is my body," to convey the anti-Catholic meaning that what Jesus took into His hands was simply bread and nothing more from beginning to end. It is a curious fact that in the revision of the Authorized Version (1881), the word *it* is omitted in two places but retained in the third, thus :—"Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake *it*; and he gave to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body." To decide this issue the readings of the various manuscripts and printed copies of the Greek Testament are to be compared with the Vulgate, and the way in which the passage is found written in the greater number of these sources is so far the correct one. This majority, however, must be made up of independent witnesses, that is, each manuscript and printed copy is to represent a distinct origin, so that in no instance can one be a transcript from the other. Now, if the disputed reading came from a Hebrew source, one will not have to consult more than the 750 copies, which number passed through the hands of the learned De Rossi, and not even one of them is older than the ninth century, while all represent the text as corrected by the Masorets. If the question turns upon the originals of the New Testament, nearly twice that number of copies must be scanned.

CLASSIFICATION OF THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT MSS. INTO FAMILIES :—As the Greek transcripts were being examined separately by Bengel, a distinguished German commentator, in 1742, he detected such a striking resemblance between the manuscripts of a collection, made from the large heap before him, that one fairly represented all the others, belonging to the same assemblage. The remaining unexamined manuscripts were then inspected by him, when each disclosed the same remarkable likeness as that presented by the members of the first group, and thus the numerous New Testament Greek copies came to be classified into *families*. The cause of this resemblance was also discovered by Bengel at the same time. He traced it, for the copies of the first family, to the fact that they were taken from a Greek Testament revision, founded on quotations, made by Origen in his Homilies. The second family, he believed, had evidently inherited their uniform appearance from St. Lucian's and Hesychius's revisions, which incurred the censure of St. Jerome for replacing the rough but honest Hebrewisms of the old text with polished but ambiguous Greek. This happy thought of Bengel's was still crude in 1796, when Griesbach matured it by arranging all the Greek manuscripts, to be found, into three families—the Western, Alexandrian, and Byzantine. The Greek Testament quotations, with

which the works of Origen and of St. Clement of Alexandria abounded, were, in Griesbach's estimation, equivalent to a new revision, out of which he drew the whole Alexandrian family of Greek copies. The writings of Tertullian, St. Cyprian of Carthage, and other lights of the Western Church, suggested another large and important family—the Western; while the third, or Byzantine family had its origin in a revision belonging to the fourth century, and universally adopted throughout the Patriarchate of Constantinople or Byzantium. And thus instead of being obliged to collate the 1,400 Greek copies, known at present, as well as the many more that might be found in the future, one will have to consult a solitary member only from each of the three families. This is most decidedly a relief from the Herculean labours previously borne by indefatigable workers like Walton (1667) and Mill (1707). It is not, however, pretended that this division of Griesbach's is perfect in every minute detail, and yet some Biblical scholars reject it on this account, but critics of the greatest weight, like Tischendorf, have adopted it, with slight modifications, while all do not join Griesbach in setting the highest critical value on the Alexandrian family. At the same time it is right to state that the Greek Testament manuscripts which approach nearest to the autographs in point of time, are, by a consensus of learned opinion, those of the Alexandrian family,

and so they stand highest in critical authority. The truth is that the old Latin Version (*Vetus Italica*), which St. Jerome made the substratum of the Vulgate edition, has been taken from the Alexandrian collection, and hence the bulk of Protestant critics affect to depreciate the superiority of the Alexandrian family, by making it inferior for instance to the Byzantine.

Whether the manuscripts of the Alexandrian family approach nearer than those of the Byzantine collection to the originals in point of time, may be disputed, but it is beyond controversy that some of the Greek manuscripts now existing are as old as the fourth century, and therefore are better witnesses for the true reading in the *New*, than existing Hebrew manuscripts, are for the *Old Testament*.

PRINTED EDITIONS:—And, now, it is well to notice these printed editions of the Bible, which may be usefully consulted in fixing the correct reading of the Scripture text. The Greek Testament was first printed (1514) by Cardinal Ximenes in his celebrated Complutensian Polyglot, already described. This was followed in succession from 1516 to 1535 by five editions, from the fertile but not very accurate pen of Erasmus, and from these, together with the Complutensian Polyglot came the many splendid editions of the Greek Testament, which constitute the glory of Biblical criticism in these later times. Then the French publisher, Etienne, subsi-

dized by a grant from the Royal purse, sent forth no fewer than four editions in the five years between 1546 and 1551. Theodore Beza, taking Etienne's third edition as his groundwork, produced from 1546 to 1598, five editions, severely critical, but highly seasoned with his own Calvinistic tendencies. These, in turn, supplied the Elzevirs, enterprising printers at Leyden in 1624, with the material for several new editions. In their preface to the third edition they called their text *receptus*, and since then it is known as the *common* Greek text. It was this third edition that formed the basis of Walton's excellent Greek Testament in his London Polyglot (1657), and of the still more correct edition of Dr. Mill (Oxford, 1707), which cost him thirty years hard work, and in that time he collected and compared some 30,000 various readings.

Bengel (1734), Wetstein (1751), and Griesbach (1796), occupied in Germany the same place as Walton and Mill did in England, namely, that of the first men of the age in publishing the most correct New Testament Greek text. Among the most recent contributors to this important department of Biblical criticism may be mentioned Dr. Scholz (1830), and Lachman (1831). But Tischendorf (1841-1873), is justly entitled to the praise of having published a purer Greek text than any hitherto known, though it is here and there disfigured with the traces of his own tenets.

The whole of the *Old* Testament in Hebrew with vowel points, but not the Masora, was printed for the first time in 1488, at Soncino, a town in Lombardy. An improved edition was published six years later in Brescia, and it is remarkable for being the basis of Luther's German translation of the Old Testament. The second Hebrew Bible was printed also with the vowel points in the Complutensian Polyglot (1514). After this Daniel Bomberg, a wealthy printer of Venice, employed the distinguished Rabbi Ben-Chajim in bringing through the press a new edition of the Hebrew Bible. It came out in 1526, with the commentaries of the Rabbins attached, and hence its name of the Rabbinical Bible. This held the field for some 140 years, when it made way first for the fine Hebrew Bible edited by the learned Leusden, and, secondly, for the edition of Van-der-Hooght, the best yet produced, and which has been followed in every edition of the Hebrew Scriptures since published.

The ancient and modern versions throw great light upon the state of the text, and must not, therefore, be ignored in deciding the true reading of any passage in the Greek or Hebrew of the Bible. In this matter, however, it is well to remember that the ancient are of more weight than the modern versions, since they carry the reader back nearer to the originals. Then the closer a version follows the text which it represents,

the better it is as a witness of the true reading. Versions, therefore, are an important factor in this and similar investigations, and the older and more literal they are the greater is their authority, provided they have been made by persons well acquainted with the Hebrew and Greek, and especially if they belong to a time when the language of the originals was still living.

The correct reading is confirmed by examining and comparing the quotation of the passage in the writings of the early Fathers and the Liturgy of the Church. The same Old Testament quotations, if found in the New Testament, in the writings of Josephus, in the Talmud, in the marginal notes of the Masora, will help to dispel any difficulties that may darken the readings of the Hebrew text. This extrinsic evidence can be greatly strengthened by such intrinsic testimony as is supplied by the scope and style of the writers, by the context and parallelism, so that whenever a link is found wanting in the chain of extrinsic evidence this can be supplied by intrinsic criteria.

To sum up, therefore, the Greek Testament has been collated with its various manuscripts and printed editions; with its ancient and modern versions, as well as fragments, found in the writings of the Fathers and in the Liturgies of the early Church. So too, the Hebrew Bible has been critically compared with its own copies and editions, its versions,

its quotations in the New Testament, in the Jewish commentaries, and writings of the Christian Church. And now what is the outcome? That the substance of the text has been found to be untouched, while the alterations are removed and the true reading fixed.





CHAPTER VI.

CREDIBILITY OF THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS.

Definition of Credibility—Credibility of New Testament proved I° by character of those sent to teach truths of the New Testament and II° by miracles—By these miracles the established order of nature was neither violated nor suspended—Hume in his “Essay on Miracles” (1742), failed to prove these miracles incredible—Between these miracles and the laws of nature harmony prevails—In these miracles one sees that the Divine will works out its beneficent object not in the ordinary way—The fact of the New Testament miracles is certain—The miracles of New Testament not produced by any secondary cause—The Catholic argument regarding these miracles cogently put by St. Thomas of Aquin—The Atheistic or Rationalistic mode of accounting for the miracles of New Testament—These miracles treated by Strauss and Renan as mythical traditions—How German Rationalists of the Heidelberg School explain these miracles—Knowledge of laws and properties of nature possessed by Spirits—Miracles of New Testament were not effected by the agency of Spirits—The miraculous cures in the Gospel—Some facts taken from Gospel history to cast suspicion on its credibility—Credibility of Old Testament proved by testimony of Christ and His Apostles.

CREDIBILITY is the quality of being worthy of belief, and this belongs to the Bible if its doctrines and facts command the fullest confidence.

THE CREDIBILITY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT is established :—I. By the character of the men *sent* to promulgate its truths. Some of these divine legates were present at what they relate, while the

others had their information from immediate witnesses. The Evangelist, St. John, says:—"That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the word of life. . . . That which we have seen and have heard, we declare unto you, that you also may have fellowship with us, and our fellowship may be with the Father, and with His Son, Jesus Christ" (1 Epistle i. 1-3). And St. Luke declares:—"According as they have delivered them unto us, who from the beginning were eye-witnesses, and ministers of the word" (St. Luke i. 2). What they thus acquired was faithfully delivered because it was impossible for unlearned men as they were, to fabricate the moral sublimity of the character of Christ. Besides they could not impose upon the public for purposes of gain or other selfish objects. Their doctrines were preached in some of the great centres of civilization, and warmly adopted by many, who were sure to satisfy themselves, antecedently, that the faith, proposed for their acceptance, was what it professed to be. There was question of their embracing the system of:—"Christ crucified, unto the Jews, indeed, a stumbling block, and unto the Gentiles foolishness" (1 Corinthians i. 23). They were asked therefore, to profess the Christian religion, which, in its practice, required from them an unconditional surrender of many things they held dear.

II. By the Miracles of the Old and New Testament:—That these miracles furnish an irrefragable argument for the credibility of the Bible follows from the fact that by them God wished to confirm what was taught in His name. He accordingly directed His official representatives to work these miracles as a proof that it was God Himself who spoke. It was with these credentials Moses and the Prophets were commissioned to carry the Divine message to the chosen people. Again when Jesus appointed the Apostles to teach His doctrines, He told them to “heal the sick, raise the dead, cleanse the lepers, cast out devils” (Mathew x. 8). They acted accordingly:—“But they going forth preached everywhere, the Lord working withal, and confirming the word with signs that followed” (Mark xvi. 20).

Our Blessed Lord avowed more than once that His miracles were intended to be a public proof of His Divine teaching. When the Pharisees upbraided Him with “casting out devils by Beelzebub, the prince of devils,” He forcibly answered:—“But if I by the finger of God cast out devils, doubtless the Kingdom of God has come upon you” (Luke xi. 20). And on a memorable occasion when the Jews threatened “to stone” Jesus because He said, “I and the Father are one,” His gentle remonstrance was:—“If I do not the works of my Father, “believe me not. But if I do, though you will not

“believe me, believe the works, that you may know
“and believe that the Father is in me, and I in the
“Father” (John x. 37, 38).

The Apostles, like their Divine Master, appeal to these miracles as a proof that the Gospel, which they announced, was from God. For instance, St. John says:—“Many other signs also did Jesus in the sight
“of His disciples, which are not written in this book.
“But these are written, that you may believe that
“Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that
“believing you may have life in His name” (John xx. 30, 31), and St. Peter in his discourse at the time of Pentecost spoke thus:—“Ye men of Israel,
“hear these words, Jesus of Nazareth, a man
“approved of God among you, by miracles and
“wonders and signs, which God did by him in the
“midst of you, as you also know” (Acts ii. 22).

By these miracles the established order of nature has neither been violated nor suspended, and consequently Hume has failed to prove these miracles incredible when he argues in his “Essay on Miracles” (1742) that such a violation or suspension was absolutely impossible. The laws that govern the world have their source in the providence of God, so that they cannot be in opposition to the Divine will. Now God wishes that miracles be performed for certain ends, and, therefore, between them and the laws of nature a perfect harmony prevails. How this concord may be effected is not

given to man here below to understand. In these miracles, without being able to ascertain the way by which the marvellous effect has been produced, one sees that the Divine Will, works out its beneficent object not in the ordinary way. And thus it happens that the acceptance of the Scripture miracles neither subverts the government of this world by certain fixed laws, nor tends to reduce the universe to its original chaos.

THE FACT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT MIRACLES IS CERTAIN :—This fact was confidently brought forward in the presence of our Blessed Lord's determined enemies, who were in the position to contradict it if they could, for they were near the time when, and close to the scene where Jesus lived and died. Therefore to delude the public mind was impossible in the circumstances. Then again, these miracles took place in the open light of day, and were published on the authority of personal witnesses, who could not be deceived, and who had nothing to expect here except bitter trials, persecution, and even death itself, for steadfastly proclaiming them.

THE MIRACLES OF THE NEW TESTAMENT WERE NOT PRODUCED BY ANY SECONDARY CAUSE:—One of the most impressive of the New Testament miracles was the raising of Lazarus from the dead, which is told by St. John as follows :—“ When “ Mary therefore was come where Jesus was, seeing “ Him she fell down at His feet, and saith to Him :

“Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother had not
“died. Jesus, therefore, when He saw her weeping,
“and the Jews that were come with her, weeping,
“groaned in the spirit, and troubled Himself. And
“said: Where have you laid him? They say to
“Him: Lord come and see. And Jesus wept.
“The Jews, therefore, said: Behold how He loved
“him. But some of them said: Could not He that
“opened the eyes of the man born blind, have
“caused that this man should not die? Jesus,
“therefore, again groaning in Himself, cometh to
“the sepulchre. Now it was a cave, and a stone
“was laid over it. Jesus saith: Take away the
“stone. Martha, the sister of him that was dead,
“saith to Him: Lord, by this time he stinketh, for
“he is now of four days. Jesus saith to her: Did
“not I say to thee, that if thou believe, thou shalt
“see the glory of God? They took, therefore, the
“stone away. And Jesus, lifting up His eyes said:
“Father I give Thee thanks that Thou hast heard
“Me. And I know that Thou hearest me always,
“but because of the people, who stand about, have
“I said it; that they may believe that Thou hast
“sent Me. When He had said these things, He cried
“with a loud voice: Lazarus, come forth. And
“presently he, that had been dead, came forth,
“bound feet and hands with winding-bands, and his
“face was bound about with a napkin. Jesus said
“to them: Loose him and let him go. Many,

“therefore, of the Jews, who were come to Mary
“and Martha, and had seen the things that Jesus
“did, believed in Him ” (Gospel of St. John xi.
32-45). And again:—“Jesus, therefore, six days
“before the pasch came to Bethania, where Lazarus
“had been dead, whom Jesus raised to life. And
“they made Him a supper there: and Martha
“served, but Lazarus was one of them that were at
“table with Him ” (Gospel of St. John xii. 1, 2).
Here then it is related that Lazarus, who had been
so long dead and buried as to be rotting in the
grave, was brought back to life by our Blessed Lord,
and that after being thus restored, took his place
once more among the family-circle, filling his
vacant seat at the table, and joining in the daily
duties:—“And they made Him a supper there,
“and Martha served, but Lazarus was one of
“them that were at table with Him.” Now one is
forced to conclude that this miracle was effected,
not by any secondary cause, but by God alone,
“Father, I give Thee thanks that Thou hast heard
“Me. And I knew that Thou hearest Me always, but
“because of the people who stand about, have I said
“it ; that they may believe that Thou hast sent Me.”
So too when the disciples of St. John, the Baptist,
came direct from their master to ask our Divine
Lord :—“Art Thou He that art to come, or look we
“for another ? And Jesus making answer, said to
‘ them : Go and relate to John what you have

“heard and seen. The blind see, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead rise again, the poor have the Gospel preached to them” (Matthew xi. 3-5). No power of man, except he get it from God, could make “the blind see, the deaf hear, the lame walk, and the dead rise again.” The “Angel of the Schools,” St. Thomas, writing on this subject in his work *against the Gentiles* (Book i. Chapter vi.) puts the Catholic argument cogently when he says: —“That a few men having no learning or temporal influence, could succeed without the aid of miracles in converting the world to the Christian religion, so difficult of assent in its doctrines, so irksome in its precepts, and so unreal in its hopes, was the greatest of all miracles.”

THE ATHEISTIC AND RATIONALISTIC METHOD OF ACCOUNTING FOR THE MIRACLES OF THE NEW TESTAMENT:—These miracles, therefore, were undoubted facts, and they were not effected by any secondary cause. The argument, furnished by these miracles is so conclusive against the enemies of the Christian religion that they have been expending their energies in a childish effort to destroy trust in their evidence. And so in the “Leben Jesu” of Strauss, as well as in the “Vic de Jesus” and “Les Apotres” of Renan, to which allusion has been made, the miracles of the New Testament are explained as *mythical* traditions, that prevailed among the Jews, regarding their expected Messiah,

and which were falsely, but cleverly ascribed by the Evangelists to their own favourite. This assertion, however, is so impossible in its conception, as to excite contempt rather than serious notice.

German Rationalists, of the Heidelberg School, while admitting the fact of these miracles, try to show that some of them, as the raising of Lazarus from the dead, were the result of collusion, either between the parties themselves, or between the miracle-worker and the evil spirits, as in the case of multiplying "the five loaves and two fishes," so as to satisfy "five thousand" hungry men. (Matthew xiv.) But on these, as on other occasions of the kind, Jesus was closely watched by very sharp-witted men, who were employed by the Synagogue for the express purpose of detecting even the semblance of any such deceit. So it remained for the modern enemies of the Divinity of Christ to make the pitiful attempt, to say nothing of its blasphemous character. It is to be observed, in reference to the power of the spirits, that, as incorporeal beings, even had they received from God a knowledge of the laws and properties of nature, which might render them equal to any of the miracles of the Bible, including those of the Gospel, still it is absolutely certain that these miracles were not accomplished by the agency of either angel or fiend. God decreed, as we have seen, by these miracles, to give probative force to the

doctrines, taught in His name, and surely He would not permit the spirits to usurp this divine warrant, which was committed exclusively to His *authorized* teachers.

It is also pretended that the persons, represented in the Gospel history as *possessed*, were merely epileptics and maniacs, who recovered through the application of the usual remedies, and that the sick, mentioned in the New Testament, had their health restored by medicine, while the blind, the lame, and the deaf were healed by surgical treatment. These cures, however, were not only complete, but instantaneous, and consequently could not be effected by any natural agency.

There are in the Gospels themselves some parts, which are commonly brought forward to weaken the credibility of the New Testament writers. Thus in St. Luke's Gospel (Chapter ii. 1-5) it is stated that our Lord was born in the year in which Augustus Cæsar ordered a census of his Empire, and that this census was made under the supervision of Cyrinus, Governor of Syria. Now the Emperor Augustus, they say, instituted no such census in that year, for it is not mentioned by Tacitus, Suctonius, or Dion Cassius, who faithfully record all the acts of the reign of Augustus Cæsar. Besides Josephus in his *Antiquities* (xvii. and xviii.), says that this Cyrinus or Quirinus, did not become Governor of Syria until some years after our Lord's

birth. The second argument advanced against this *credibility* is that St. Luke does not say one word about the coming of the Magi to the crib, the flight into Egypt, or the Massacre of the Innocents, though his object in writing the Gospel was to record every detail of our Lord's birth and infancy. Then, St. Matthew (ii. 1, 2, 3) fixes the flight into Egypt immediately after the departure of the Magi, and thus leaves no interval for the Purification, and Presentation, related by St. Luke. While St. Luke (ii. 7-43) states that immediately after the Presentation the Holy Family came to Nazareth, and dwelt there permanently, thus leaving no room for the flight into Egypt, mentioned by St. Mathew. But, in answer to the first allegation, Tacitus, Suetonius, and Dion Cassius, do record a census, commanded by Augustus Cæsar in the eighth year before the Christian era, that is, three years previous to the birth of Christ, for the Christian era dates from the fifth year after our Lord's birth. Thus the census would be instituted in the third year before the birth of Jesus, and completed when He was born. It is not improbable too that Cyrinus was specially sent to Syria and Palestine to preside over this census, and that thirteen years after when Quinctilius Varus died, he was appointed to succeed as governor of the province with which he had official connection.

As to the second allegation, it is no doubt true that St. Luke, in writing his Gospel, proposed to

give the Purification and Presentation, etc., which were not mentioned by the other Evangelists; but his object was not certainly to touch upon *every* detail of our Lord's life. Then St. Luke's account does not contradict that of St. Matthew, for St. Luke states that the Presentation and Purification took place forty days after the birth of our Lord, while St. Matthew begins his narrative at this point, and follows with the account of the coming of the Magi, and of the flight into Egypt. This explanation would require, no doubt, that the Magi adored the Divine infant in Nazareth, and not in Bethlehem, and such an event is very probable.

CREDIBILITY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT:—Christ and His Apostles pronounced the Old Testament Scriptures to be credible. Their declaration to this effect is given in the New Testament Scriptures, and the testimony of these writings is conclusive, seeing that they are not only genuine, but written by truthful men, as has been amply demonstrated. St. John, the Evangelist, in his account of the well-known scene at the “pond called Probatica,” states that the wonderful cure, by our Blessed Lord of “a certain man there, who had been eight and thirty years under his infirmity,” so irritated the Jews that:—“Hereupon, they sought the more to kill Him, because He did not only break the Sabbath, but also said God was His Father, making Himself equal to God.” The veracity of Jesus in thus “making

himself equal to God" was publicly impeached by the Jews, and He met the challenge by referring them to their Scriptures as the collection of the Old Testament books was then familiarly designated : "Search the Scriptures, for you think in them to have life everlasting, and the same are they that give testimony of Me . . . For if you did believe Moses, you would, perhaps, believe Me also. For he wrote of Me. But if you do not believe his writings, how will you believe My words?" (John v. 18-47.) Here our Blessed Lord rested the proof of His Divinity on the credibility of the Old Testament, and in particular on the part of it, which He attributed to Moses.

St. Paul exhorted his favourite disciple, Timothy, to study the Old Testament assiduously, because, he said it "is profitable to teach, to reprove, to correct, to instruct in justice" (2 Epistle to Timothy iii. 16). And St. Peter, speaking of the Old Testament as "the prophecy of Scripture," declared it to have been written by "the holy men of God . . . inspired by the Holy Ghost" (2 Epistle of St. Peter i. 21). Would these Apostles have talked so confidently, if they had not been fully convinced of the credibility of the Old Testament? And what they published in this way is infallibly true. They worked miracles, and it has been shown that the power thus exercised, was given expressly by God, as a guarantee that the persons who performed these miracles, were clothed

with His authority, so that God Himself is security for what Christ and His apostles taught.

Then, there is nothing in the Pentateuch but what Moses could know either from personal experience, or upon the testimony of persons, whose exceptionally long lives, brought them into close connection with the circumstances mentioned. The information obtained, through these channels, Moses faithfully registered, for he neither palliated nor denied his own sins, nor those of his brother, Aaron, and his sister, Miriam. The same candour marks the narrative of every other writer of the Old Testament books, and it is the very best evidence of their having been truthful throughout, not to speak of their repeatedly appealing to the public annals, or official records, in support of what they affirm.





CHAPTER VII.

INSPIRATION OF THE BIBLE.

Inspiration; what it is—That the writers of the Bible were inspired is of divine and catholic faith—Evidence for inspiration of the whole Bible to be found in Tradition alone—Nature of inspiration never solemnly declared by Catholic Church; but she has defined what it is not—Negative and positive assistance; what they are—It is theologically certain that inspiration consists not in negative but in Positive Assistance—Extent of inspiration—It covers every truth, either doctrinal or moral in Scripture; every doctrinal fact, and every historical fact, as far as it regards its substance—Cardinal Newman on the extent of inspiration—Verbal inspiration—Not only the sentences in the Scripture are inspired, but the words, where such are necessary to express correctly any of the truths or facts—No translation of the Bible inspired, but it is *de fide* that the Latin vulgate is authentic—Protestants, but not all, admit the inspiration of the Bible—The arguments they advance fail to prove it.

INSPIRATION OF THE BIBLE:—Inspiration is the divine influence on the writers of the Scripture, moving their wills to write, enlightening their minds to know the truths they are to write, and safeguarding them against error in writing what God has thus proposed to them to be written. St. Paul, in his Second Epistle to Timothy (iii. 16), assures him that “all the holy Scripture,” known to this favourite disciple from his infancy, was “*θεοπνευστος*,” literally *breathed into* by

God. This divine *afflatus* under the name of Inspiration belongs to the Old and New Testament Books. The Catholic Church proposes this truth in these words of the Vatican Council (1870):—

“Further, this supernatural revelation, according
“to the universal belief of the Catholic Church,
“declared by the Sacred Synod of Trent, is
“contained in the written books, and unwritten
“traditions which have reached us, having been
“received by the Apostles from the mouth of
“Christ Himself, or delivered as if by the hands
“of the Apostles from the dictation of the
“Holy Ghost. And these books of the Old and
“New Testament are to be received as Sacred and
“Canonical in their integrity with all their parts,
“as they are enumerated in the decree of the
“Sacred Council, and are contained in the old
“Latin edition of the Vulgate. And the Church
“holds them Sacred and Canonical . . . *because*
“*having been written by the inspiration of the Holy*
“*Ghost (Spiritu Sancto inspirante conscriptae),*
“they have God for their author, and have been
“delivered as such by the Church herself.”

(Dogmatic Constitution on the Catholic Faith. Chapter ii. of Revelation, Sess. iii.) That God, therefore, inspired the writers of the Old and New Testament, is of divine and catholic faith, and, like every other catholic dogma, must be contained either in Scripture or Tradition.

In the Scripture mention is made of the Old Testament having been written by command of God (Exodus xvii. 14; Jeremias xxx. 2; Isaias viii. 1; Ezechiel xxiv. 2; Habacuc ii. 2; and Daniel xxii. 4); and St. Paul (2 Timothy iii. 16), says:—“All Scripture inspired of God is profitable to teach, to reprove, to correct, to instruct in justice.” St. Peter, too (2nd Epistle i. 19-21), writes:—“And “we have the more firm prophetic word: where-
“unto you do well to attend, as to a light that
“shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and
“the day-star arise in your hearts. Understanding
“this first that no prophecy of Scripture is made
“by private interpretation. For prophecy came
“not by the will of man at any time; but the
“holy men of God spoke, *inspired by the Holy Ghost*
“(υπο πνευματος αγιου φερομενοι).” This testimony of the Apostles, unlike that quoted above from Exodus and the Prophets, is sufficiently explicit; but it can have reference to the inspiration of the Old Testament only.

The Scripture evidence for the inspiration of the New Testament writers is taken 1° from the 2nd Epistle of St. Peter (iii. 15), recommending to the faithful St. Paul’s Epistles, because they are “*written according to the wisdom given him.*” This announcement of inspiration begins and ends with St. Paul’s Epistles, and they are not the whole of the New Testament. 2°. In St. John’s Gospel (xiv., xv. and

xvi.), Jesus promised to make the Apostles and their successors infallible for ever. "The Holy Ghost whom the Father will send in my name, he will teach you all things." But infallibility and inspiration are not convertible terms. Hence it follows that the fact of the inspiration of the whole Bible can be found in Tradition alone, that is, the collection of Divine truths, delivered orally by the Apostles, and the pastors of the Church in regular succession, under the active presence of the Paraclete. The value of this oral teaching in the Catholic Church is estimated by St. Augustine when he writes:—"I would not believe the Gospel if the authority of the Church did not move me thereto." (Book against Manes's Epistle of the Foundation, Chap. V.)

NATURE OF INSPIRATION.—The Catholic Church has finally decided not only that the inspiration of the Old and New Testament is part of the Christian faith; but that this inspiration does not consist either in these Scriptures "containing revelation without error," or in their being the writer's own work, and then approved by the Holy Ghost. This is what the Vatican Council proposes in the following terms:—"And the Church holds them" (the books of the Old and New Testament), "Sacred and Canonical, *not because having* "been composed by human industry alone, they "were afterwards approved by her authority, nor

“merely because they contain the revelation without “error.” (Dogmatic Constitution of the Catholic Faith, Chap. II. of Revelation, Sess. III.) Therefore, while the Catholic Church has not declared what is the nature of inspiration, she has defined what it is not.

POSITIVE ASSISTANCE:—God is said to have given the writers of the Old and New Testament *positive assistance* by 1stly, moving their wills to write; 2ndly, proposing to the mind of these writers not merely the truths they were to set forth in the holy Scripture; but His divine wish that these truths only should be written; and 3rdly, making the writer’s minds proof against error in recording what He thus conveyed to them to be written.

NEGATIVE ASSISTANCE:—The divine concurrence with the sacred writers, that lies in the third or last constituent principle of positive assistance is called negative assistance, because by it God exercised a mere negative influence on their minds by preventing them from the possibility of error. Assuredly this negative assistance would render the writers of the Old and New Testament infallible. But it is one thing to protect their minds from the danger of error, and quite a different thing to make them acquainted with the divine truths to be written. The Fathers of a General Council are infallible, and their decrees without taint of error; but it has

never been even contended, that these Fathers and their decrees are inspired.

Though the nature of inspiration has not been solemnly settled by the Church it is theologically certain that inspiration consists not in negative, but in positive assistance. And, indeed, the dogma of inspiration proclaimed by the Vatican Council (1870), merely affirms in more explicit language that God is the Author of the Old and New Testament, an article of divine and Catholic faith defined by the Council of Florence (1439), and of Trent (1545-1563). Now, it is impossible that God could be what He is here solemnly pronounced to be, namely, the principal Author of the Old and New Testament, unless He disposed the wills of the immediate writers of these sacred books to their work, and at the same time enlightened their intellects so as to know whatever He proposed to them to write, and in the second place His wish that neither more nor less than what He committed to them should be written. The truths which God thus ordained to be communicated to men through the channel of the Old and New Testament were 1°, mysteries, that surpass all human understanding, as well as truths not above the ken of reason, and the light by which He made known the doctrines contained under these two heads, is revelation, though strictly speaking this is applied to imparting the secrets of the

Christian faith. 2°. Those things which they themselves witnessed or received from persons on the spot. This St. John mentions in the opening words of his first Epistle:—"That which was from "the beginning, which we have heard, which "we have seen with our eyes, which we "have looked upon, and our hands have handled, "of the Word of Life: for the life was manifested; and we have seen, and do bear witness, "and declare unto you the life eternal, which was "with the Father, and hath appeared to us; that "which we have seen and heard we declare unto "unto you." As to these facts God required merely to bring them back to the the writer's memory. 3°. Passages taken out of profane authors like Epimenides, from whom St. Paul quotes in his Epistle to Titus:—"The Cretians are always liars, evil beasts, slothful bellies" (i. 12). Again, the reproaches of Job's friends, the vain reasonings of the wicked in the Book of Wisdom (chap. ii.), and the words of the man born blind in St. John's Gospel:—"Now we know that God doth not hear sinners . . ." (ix. 31). In all this the divine operation on the minds of the sacred writers consisted in intimating to them to relate these expressions of other people. God inspired the quoting of these expressions, which, therefore, must have been truly spoken by the persons to whom they are attributed; but He

did not inspire the utterances themselves. 4°. Finally, God by His light so fortified the intellects of the Old and New Testament writers, as to prevent, on their part, the possibility of error in recording what He thus put before them to be written. Inspiration, therefore, while it includes revelation, and negative assistance, does not consist in either one or the other, or both ; but in positive assistance.

EXTENT OF INSPIRATION :—Having determined the nature of inspiration it now remains to fix its limits. 1°. With respect to the truths and facts, inspiration extends to every truth, either doctrinal or moral in the Scripture ; to every doctrinal fact and to every historical fact, so far as it regards its substance. This is a necessary conclusion from the same Dogmatic Constitution of the Vatican Council, which has been mentioned already :—“ And these books of the Old and “ New Testament are to be received as Sacred “ and Canonical in their integrity *with all their* “ *parts*, as they are enumerated in the decree of “ the Sacred Council (Trent), and are contained in “ the old Latin edition of the Vulgate. *And the* “ *Church holds them Sacred and Canonical . . .* “ *because having been written by the inspiration of* “ *the Holy Ghost (Spiritu Sancto inspirante con-* “ *scriptae) they have God for their author.*” (Dogmatic Constitution of the Catholic Faith, Ch. II.

of Revelation, Sess. III). Here the Vatican Fathers chose as the object of their particular legislation "the decree concerning the Canonical Scriptures" passed in Session IV. of the Council of Trent:—
 "But if any one receive not as Sacred and Canonical the said books entire *with all their parts*, as they have been used to be read in the Catholic Church, and as they are contained in the old Latin Vulgate Edition . . . let him be anathema." Therefore the Church has infallibly pronounced *every part* in the Old and New Testament (*cum omnibus suis partibus*) to be sacred and canonical, "*because they are inspired*," that is every doctrine, every moral precept, every doctrinal fact, and also every historical fact, as far as its substance is concerned, forms a *part* of the Bible, and is, therefore, inspired. St. Paul tells the Romans:—
 "For what things soever were written, were written for our learning" (Epistle to the Romans xv. 4). This is what Cardinal Newman has expressed in an article in the February Number (1884) of *The Nineteenth Century Review*:—"As to the authority of Scripture, we hold it to be, in all matters of faith and morals, divinely inspired throughout." He then points out the field covered by his word *throughout*:—"But while the Councils, as has been shown, lay down so emphatically the inspiration of Scripture in respect to 'faith and morals,' it is remarkable that they do not say

“a word directly as to its inspiration in matters of
“fact. Yet are we, therefore, to conclude that the
“record of facts in Scripture does not come under
“the guarantee of its inspiration? We are not so to
“conclude, and for this plain reason:—The sacred
“narrative, carried on through so many ages, what is
“it but the very matter for our faith, and rule of our
“obedience? What but that narrative itself is the
“supernatural teaching, in order to which inspira-
“tion is given? What is the whole history, traced
“out in Scripture from Genesis to Esdras, and
“thence on to the end of the Acts of the Apostles,
“but a manifestation of Divine Providence, on the
“one hand interpretative, on a large scale and with
“analogical applications of universal history, and
“on the other preparatory, typical and predictive,
“of the Evangelical Dispensation? Its pages
“breathe of providence and grace, of our Lord,
“and of His work and teaching, from beginning to
“end. It views facts in those relations in which
“neither ancients, such as the Greek and Latin
“classical historians, nor moderns, such as Niebuhr,
“Grote, Ewald, or Michelet, can view them. In
“this point of view it has God for its author, even
“though the finger of God traced no words but the
“Decalogue. Such is the claim of Bible history in
“its substantial fulness to be accepted *de fide* as
“true. In this point of view, Scripture is in-
“spired, not only in faith and morals, but in all

“parts which bear on faith, including matters of fact.”

There are, however, in the historical part of the Bible, some small circumstances, or details, which do not touch the substance of the fact. Hence the Cardinal adds:—“And here I am led to inquire whether *obiter dicta* are conceivable in an inspired document. . . . By *obiter dicta* I also mean such statements as we find in the Book of Judith, that Nabuchodonosor was King of Ninive. Now it is in favour of there being such unauthoritative *obiter dicta*, . . . not doctrinal, but mere unimportant statements of fact. . . . There does not then seem any serious difficulty in admitting their existence in Scripture. Let it be observed, its miracles are doctrinal facts, and in no sense of the phrase can be considered *obiter dicta*.” In this there is nothing to offend the most sensitive theological acumen, for there are in the Sacred Scripture what the Cardinal calls “*obiter dicta*, mere unimportant statements of fact,” and since they do not belong essentially to the faithful record of the fact itself, they can only serve to make the narrative more complete and more vivid, as for example, what is told of the dog of Tobias “showing his joy by his fawning and wagging his tail” (Tobias xi. 9). Now to relate an historical fact with more vividness and completeness is purely ornamental. It is entirely a matter of taste as well

as of education, and the keenest theologian can hardly advocate such *plenary* inspiration as would deprive the sacred penmen of the exercise of their own taste and education in all that is not necessary for the faithful record of the facts, proposed to them by God to be written. But since the Scripture narrative cannot be false in any particular, even these "*obiter dicta*, mere unimportant statements of fact," are safe-guarded from error by negative assistance, which is all that can be required, and not by positive assistance, or inspiration proper, which would be superfluous in the circumstances, and God never performs a superfluous act.

Cardinal Newman sums up all in a postscript to his article:—"These two Councils (*i.e.*, Trent "and the Vatican), decide that the Scriptures are "inspired throughout, but not inspired by an immediately divine act, but through the instrumentality "of inspired men; that they are inspired in all "matters of faith and morals, meaning thereby, "not only theological doctrine, but also the historical "and prophetic narratives, which they contain, "from Genesis to the Acts of the Apostles; and "lastly, that being inspired because written by "inspired men, they have a human side, which "manifests itself in language, style, tone of thought, "character, intellectual peculiarities, and such infirmities, not sinful as belong to our nature, and "which in important matters may issue in what in

“doctrinal definitions is called an *obiter dictum*.
“At the same time, the gift of inspiration being
“divine, a Catholic must never forget that what he
“is handling is in a true sense the Word of God,
“which, as I said in my Article by reason of the
“difficulty of always drawing the line between what
“is human and what is divine, cannot be put on the
“level with other books, as it is now the fashion
“to do, but has the nature of a Sacrament, which
“is outward and inward, and a channel of super-
“natural grace.”

VERBAL INSPIRATION:—2nd. With regard to the words of the Scripture, and its style of composition, inspiration extends not only to the sentences in the context; but to a particular word or words where such are necessary to exhibit accurately any truth or fact contained in the Holy Scriptures. The reason is that by negative assistance, which is an essential element in inspiration, the Old and New Testament writers are secured from the possibility of error in recording whatever God instructed them to set forth, and they are consequently infallible in the choice of the word or words that truly represent the doctrines, moral precepts, and facts to be entered in the Bible. If these doctrines, precepts, and facts can be as accurately announced in one set of words, as in another, then God leaves the choice of the words to the writers themselves. Hence, in the Scriptures generally, the phrases and their combination

bear the impress of the intellectual training and disposition of each of the writers. Thus, for example, though our Blessed Lord used one set of words only in teaching the institution of the Blessed Eucharist, they are variously given by the four Evangelists. This shows that the writers of the Old and New Testament were not mere mechanical transcribers, but intelligent men, who were permitted by God to exercise their own taste in selecting their vocabulary and style in all that did not appertain essentially to the faithful expression of the truths, which God wished them to publish in their writings. This is precisely what the author of the II Book of Machabees did when he says:—"If I have done my
"narration well, and as it becometh the history,
"it is what I desired; but if not so perfectly, it
"must be pardoned me; for as it is hurtful to drink
"always wine, or always water, but pleasant to
"use sometimes the one, and sometimes the other;
"so if the speech be always nicely framed, it will
"not be grateful to the readers" (xv. 39, 40). Here it is well to add that no translation of the Bible is inspired; but it has been conclusively shown in the chapter on the Reading the Scriptures in the Vernacular, that the Catholic Church has solemnly pronounced the Old Latin Vulgate to be authentic, that is, to give the originals without substantial error.

Protestants, but not all, admit the inspiration of

the Bible. Now what are their proofs for this belief? There are external proofs which most Protestants make to consist in the fact of the writers being Apostles, and performing miracles. The fact that one is an Apostle, and performs miracles, does not necessarily imply that what he writes is inspired. Luther, according to his own testimony as well as that of very many Protestants, was divinely sent, and performed miracles. Yet no Protestant will say that Luther's writings are divinely inspired. The messengers, sent by God, to propose His revelation, wrought miracles in proof of their divine mission, and of the truth of what they taught. Miracles and prophecies are evidence of the truth of a revelation; but not of the inspiration of any document.

Some Protestants, however, derive the external argument for the inspiration of the Bible from the testimony of the Christian people. It is a fact, they say, just as the definition of any dogma of belief by a general council of the Catholic Church is a fact, or as the supreme sanction of a body of laws is a fact, and as such is attested by a number of witnesses, large enough to render certain the truth of its existence. Then, there are not a few Protestants who deduce an external argument for the inspiration of the Scriptures from the Bible itself, by taking some passages from the New Testament to prove the inspiration of the whole Bible. As to the proof,

drawn from the testimony of the Christian people, there is an essential flaw in this testimony, and it is from the nature of the fact itself. Facts, resting on the testimony of men, must have certain conditions, which may be reduced to this that those persons, who witnessed them, were neither deceived, nor deceivers. Now, the inspiration of the Bible is not a fact of this kind; it is purely internal, unseen by all except by God Himself. It is, therefore, a fact of which no one, not even the writer, can have certain testimony without a new revelation that he was moved by the Spirit of light, and not by the Spirit of darkness.

Coming now to the proof of Biblical inspiration from the Scripture itself, what is wanted from Protestants is a satisfactory proof that these texts, brought forward, are themselves inspired; that taken together they refer to each and all the books of the Bible, and that they clearly assert the inspiration of the writings in question. Now, the first point Protestants can scarcely know unless by a new revelation; in the second they must ever fail, as the passages, in their greatest amplitude, refer to very few books; and in the third they are equally at fault, for most of these texts are not at all clear as to what is meant by inspiration, and some do not touch it even remotely.

And if the Protestant cannot ground the inspiration on external evidence, he will not fare better

with his internal proofs, as for instance the harmony of parts, sanctity of doctrines, and the spiritual feelings excited by the reading of the Sacred Volume. One reflection will suffice to give as a reason for refusing to admit the inspiration on this internal evidence, and it is that all these arguments, adduced from this source, may be applied to many other writings besides the Bible.





CHAPTER VIII.

CANON OF THE SACRED SCRIPTURES.

Canon—Sacred Canon—Fixed infallibly for Catholics—Found in Tradition alone—How Protestants prove the Sacred Canon—The Apocrypha—Use of this term perverted by Protestants—Catholic teaching as to the Protocanonical and Deuterocanonical Scriptures—List of the Deutero-canonical Scriptures—Jews and the Deutero-canonical books of the Old Testament—Protestants and the Deuterocanonical books of the Old and New Testaments—Genuineness of the New Testament Deuterocanonical books vindicated—Epistle of St. James—II. Epistle of St. Peter—II. and III. Epistles of St. John—Epistle of St. Jude—The Apocalypse—Gospel of St. Matthew, i. and ii. chapters—Gospel of St. Mark xvi. 8-20—Gospel of St. Luke xxii. 43, 44—Gospel of St. John viii. 1-11 and xxi.—I. Epistle of St. John v. 7..

CANON OF THE SACRED SCRIPTURES :—Canon, Greek (*κανών*) a piece of rod or stick, with which lines were drawn, and quantities measured. The name of this instrument came to denote the standard by which the qualities of things were fixed, and in the middle of the fourth century it was employed to distinguish the collection of Old and New Testament Scriptures, accepted in the Church as the Word of God, or inspired.

CATHOLICS AND THE SACRED CANON :—The Fathers of the Council of Trent declared the books of the Bible, as they are contained in *the old Latin Vulgate*

edition to form this list. They are :—"Of the Old Testament, the five books of Moses; that is Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy; Josue, Judges, Ruth, the four books of Kings, two of Paralipomenon, the first book of Esdras, and the second, which is entitled Nehemias; Tobias, Judith, Esther, Job, the Davidical psaltery, consisting of a hundred and fifty psalms; the Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, the Canticle of Canticles, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Isaias, Jeremias, with Baruch; Ezechiel, Daniel; the twelve minor prophets, to wit, Osee, Joel, Amos, Abdias, Jonas, Micheas, Nahum, Habacuc, Sophonias, Aggeus, Zacharias, Malachias; two books of the Machabees, the first and the second. Of the New Testament: the four Gospels, according to Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John; the Acts of the Apostles, written by Luke, the Evangelist; fourteen Epistles of Paul the Apostle, one to the Romans, two to the Corinthians, one to the Galatians, to the Ephesians, to the Philippians, to the Colossians, two to the Thessalonians, two to Timothy, one to Titus, to Philemon, to the Hebrews, two of Peter the Apostle, three of John the Apostle, one of the Apostle James, one of Jude the Apostle, and the Apocalypse of John the Apostle." (Decree concerning the Canonical Scriptures. Session iv.)

That these particular Scriptures, and these only, are canonical, is a fact, like that of the inspiration,

which must be contained in God's written or unwritten word, seeing that the Church, in general council, has thus solemnly adopted and proposed it. Now the well-known Scripture passage, produced as certifying to this fact, is St. Paul's statement:—"All Scripture, *inspired* of God, is profitable to teach, to reprove, to correct, to instruct in justice" (2 Timothy iii. 16). This, however, refers to the Old Testament exclusively, and even here the Apostle does not specify the parts, of his inspired series.

The fact, therefore, of the Sacred Canon is found in God's unwritten word only, and to the existence of this uniform and universal tradition in the Church of Christ, Pope Innocent I. bears splendid testimony. In a letter to Exuperius, Bishop of Toulouse in 405, the Supreme Pontiff gives the inspired books in number and name, exactly as defined by the Council of Trent, with the important assurance that such was "consecrated by the reading and fostering care of ages." Again the Councils of Hippo (393), of Carthage (397), and of Rome (493), publish a similar catalogue among their decrees. The voice of this tradition is also heard with no uncertain sound so late as 1440 in the message of Pope Eugene VI. to the Armenians. And so this fact came down from the Apostles in the channel of tradition until it was called in question by the heretics of the sixteenth century and

finally decided by the Bishops of the whole Church, assembled in Council at Trent (1545-1563).

PROTESTANTS AND THE SACRED CANON :—Such then is the proof, such the infallible authority of Catholics for the collection of those books, which constitute the canonical Scriptures. Protestants generally first prove the canonicity of the New Testament, and make it a necessary step towards proving the canon of the Old Testament. With regard to the New Testament many Protestants conclude from the fact of its books having been written by an apostle, or the disciple of an apostle, that it is, therefore, canonical. But it does not follow that because an Apostle has written a document, it is, therefore, canonical, for Protestants do not object to the opinion that much of what some of the Apostles wrote, and notably St. Paul, has been lost. Then, a writing need not have emanated from the pen of an Apostle in order to be canonical, for some very prominent books of the New Testament were written by disciples of Apostles. Nor is the authorship by the disciple of an Apostle to be made the criterion, for St. Barnabas, and St. Clement of Rome were disciples of Apostles, and yet their writings, though genuine, are not on the Canon.

Most Protestants also appear to take it for granted that the same act, which inspires a writing, inserts it on the roll of holy Scripture, and thus they confound inspiration with canonicity. But there is

nothing absurd in the notion of a book being inspired, while it has no place on the sacred list. This is evident from the fact that several inspired books were not admitted to the Jewish Canon till the time of Esdras, though they were published long before. It is confirmed by another fact, namely, that some of the books, at present enumerated in the Latin Vulgate, and sealed by the Council of Trent, were not acknowledged as inspired by the Fathers unanimously until the seventh century.

The Protestant position regarding the Sacred Canon is still further emphasized in the following extract from a modern writer :—“The Epistle to the Hebrews, though received in the East, was not received in the Latin Church till St. Jerome’s time. St. Irenaeus either does not affirm, or denies that it is St. Paul’s. Tertullian ascribes it to St. Barnabas. Caius excludes it from his list. St. Hippolytus does not receive it. St. Cyprian is silent about it.” And again :—“The New Testament consists of twenty-seven books in all of varying importance. Of these, fourteen are not mentioned at all from 80 to 100 years after St. John’s death, in which number are the Acts, the II. Corinthians, the Galatians, the Colossians, the two to Timothy, and the Epistle of St. James.” (*Tracts for the Times*, Numbers 75, 78 and 80).

The Canon, therefore, as it is in the Protestant Church, was not framed before the fourth or fifth

century. It remains that the only way the Canon could have been fixed at that period was to collect the teaching of the various Churches, and then pronounce by a definitive judgment that certain books were canonical. But, it is a leading doctrine of Protestantism that no Church has power to decide infallibly in matters of the kind.

Lastly there are Protestants, who say, that in fixing the Sacred Canon they are following with the same certainty, the same plan as that adopted by the Fathers of the early Church in determining the genuine, and consequently the Canonical books of the Scripture by the rules of sound criticism. Le Clerc is put forward as one of their most orthodox exponents of this doctrine :—"The primitive "Christians," he writes, "regarded the Scriptures as "divine, because they saw that these books contained nothing unworthy of inspired writers, "nothing contrary to the Old Testament, to right "reason, nothing which characterises authors "more recent than Apostles." Thus the examination of the doctrine is made the standard by which the claims of certain books to a place on the Canon are to be tested. But what Protestant is able by his rule of faith to judge the doctrines of the Bible, and apply this test?

THE APOCRYPHA :—Even if it were true that the examination of the doctrines determined the genuineness, it does not follow, by any means, that

this rule establishes the canonicity of a book of Scripture. Genuineness and canonicity are not inseparable, for a document may be genuine without being canonical. Thus the Epistles of St. Barnabas, and of St. Clement of Rome, the Shepherd of Hermas, the third and 4th of Esdras, 3rd and 4th of Machabees, and the 151st Psalm, were all very sacred, and truly genuine; but they never were canonical. The fact that these writings were not among the books of the Sacred Canon, was so hidden (*ἀπόκρυφος*) from some of the early Christian writers that they unwittingly, but erroneously referred to them as being on the roll of inspired Scriptures. Hence the Apocrypha; but Protestants have perverted the use of this term by misapplying it to the Deuterocanonical parts of the Bible, namely those Sacred Scriptures, whose place on the Canon was not universally admitted in the Church until the seventh century.

CATHOLICS AND THE PROTOCANONICAL AND DEUTEROCANONICAL SCRIPTURES:—For the first five centuries and more after Christianity began, the recognised Canon of inspired Scriptures did not find its way into every corner of the Church's wide domain. It happened, therefore, that the leaders of the Christian movement were not all correctly informed as to the collection, which the whole Church acknowledged to be God's written word. This, and the fear of confounding any of the Canonical Scriptures with

the Apocrypha, then in circulation, had the effect of causing not a few of the highest authority among the ancient Fathers, to suspect the divine character of several Old and New Testament books which Eusebius (Eccl. Hist.) consequently named (*αντιλεγόμενοι*). The Scriptures thus challenged are *Deuterocanonical*, because the fact of their being actually on the Canon was not generally known until the seventh century. These books and parts of books were ranked second (*Δευτερος*), while the first (*πρωτος*) place has been assigned to those Scriptures (Protocanonical) whose inspiration was never doubted (*όμολογούμενοι* according to Eusebius) by any one in the Church. Both enjoy the same authority, for both are declared to be canonical by the infallible decree of the Church.

In the New Testament the Deuterocanonical Scriptures are the Epistle of St. Paul to the Hebrews, the Epistle of St. James, Epistle of St. Jude, II. Epistle of St. Peter, II. and III. Epistles of St. John, together with his Apocalypse ; the last twelve verses of St. Mark's Gospel, the passage regarding our Lord's bloody sweat (Luke xxii.) and the history of the woman, taken in adultery (John viii.). In the Old Testament the Deuterocanonical Scriptures are Tobias, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, the two books of Machabees, the part of the book of Daniel containing the history of Susanna (xiii.), of Bel and the Dragon (xiv.), the

Canticle of the three children in the fiery furnace (iii.), and the last seven chapters of Esther.

JEWES AND THE DEUTEROCANONICAL BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT:—These Old Testament writings are not in the canon, drawn up by Esdras for his Jewish countrymen, at the close of their Babylonish captivity, 512 B.C. He could not have included Baruch, Tobias, Judith, Wisdom, or the Deuterocanonical parts of Daniel and Esther, because he did not know even of their existence, and the two books of Machabees were not written until long after the time of Esdras. However, all those that Esdras could not have noticed found their way into the *Septuagint*, and hence their inspiration was accepted by those Jews, who adopted the Septuagint collection of the Scriptures. These were *Hellenist Jews*, who had settled from time to time among the Greek colonies. But the *Hebrew Jews*, who never abandoned the language and home of their fathers, declined to count the Deuterocanonical parts of the Old Testament among their sacred Scriptures, on the ground, as Josephus remarks, that “there had been no succession of Prophets from the time of Esdras.” In controversy, therefore, with these Hebrew Jews it was perfectly useless for the champions of the Christian faith to quote from the Deuterocanonical Old Testament books. Thus it happened that these were not mentioned in the enumeration of the Catholic Canon as early as

A.D. 160 by Miletus, Bishop of Sardis, and other ancient Fathers of the time, not as a profession of their own belief; but solely for the purpose of meeting the Hebrew Jews from their own standpoint.

PROTESTANTS AND THE DEUTEROCANONICAL BOOKS OF THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT:—Luther in his German translation of the Hebrew Bible, says the Deuterocanonical Scriptures of the Old Testament are not the Word of God, but profitable for reading. He also puts in the same category the Epistle to the Hebrews as well as the Apocalypse from the New Testament, where the Epistle of St. James elicited his biting jest of “a downright strawy Epistle,” because it directly contradicted his heresy of justification by faith alone. Anglican Protestants use the Deuterocanonical parts of the Old Testament “for edification, but not for the establishment of doctrine,” on the plea that they are not of divine origin, while with strange inconsistency they receive the Deuterocanonical books of the New Testament into their collection of inspired Scriptures! Most of all the Protestant Churches, however, regard as doubtful the authorship of the New Testament Deuterocanonical books, and therefore exclude them from the collection of inspired Scriptures. But this is not a conclusive argument, for Tertullian and St. Cyprian believed in the divine authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews, though they were of opinion that St. Paul, himself, did not write it. Tertullian,

St. Cyprian, St. Clement of Rome, St. Irenæus, Origen, St. Clement of Alexandria, and St. Jerome, perceiving in this some difference of style from St. Paul's other Epistles, concluded that he was not the immediate writer of it, but only supplied the matter in Hebrew, which either St. Luke or St. Barnabas clothed in its present Greek dress. This will explain why this Pauline Epistle is not mentioned in the ancient canon of Muratori, nor in the works of some of the early Fathers. Finally, unlike St. Paul's other Epistles this one to the Hebrews does not begin with :—"Paul a servant of Jesus Christ," or words to that effect, because the very name of St. Paul was obnoxious to the Jews, and the mention of it would defeat the object of the Apostle.

EPISTLE OF ST. JAMES :—This important deutero-canonical book of the New Testament has been stigmatized by Luther as :—"The work of some unknown James, who misunderstood the doctrines of the Apostle Paul." This the arch-reformer did in order to damage, in the opinion of his followers, the character of an Epistle which he disliked most. But the best witnesses of the belief of the early Church, as represented in the West by St. Clement of Rome (1 Corinthians xxxviii.), St. Irenæus (Against Heresies, Bk. iv), St. Jerome (Illustrious Men, chap. 23); and in the east by St. Clement, of Alexandria, Origen, and St. Athanasius, as quoted

by Eusebius (Ecclesiastical History, ii., iii.), all testify to the genuineness of this Epistle. Eusebius himself, no doubt, speaks of its canonicity, but not of its genuineness, with reserve, and this cautious manner of reference, which is to be found also in a few other early Christian writers, while it has no bearing on the genuineness of this Epistle, may account for its absence from the canon of Muratori.

II. EPISTLE OF ST. PETER :—The next of the deutero-canonical books of the New Testament is St. Peter's 2nd Epistle, and its authorship has been impugned because, 1°, it is rarely or not at all quoted by any Apostolic writer; 2°, it is not among the New Testament books, translated in the famous old Syriac version, *Peschito*; 3°, there is said to be a remarkable difference of style between it and St. Peter's 1st Epistle; and 4°, St. Jerome, Origen, and Eusebius, the historian, are not in favour of its acceptance. But the alleged silence of every Apostolic writer, as well as that of the *Peschito*, in all its copies, is not a fact, and even if it were, it would amount to a negative argument only. Then we must not expect to find St. Peter's usual style in this Epistle, seeing that, as St. Jerome and St. Clement of Alexandria think, its Greek was not St. Peter's but that of St. Mark or Sylvanus, who acted as his amanuensis. Lastly, the disfavour with which this Epistle was regarded by Origen, Eusebius, and St. Jerome, has reference to its authority as a

divine or inspired Scripture, but not to its genuineness.

II. and III. Epistles of St. John. The genuineness of these Epistles is impeached on the grounds—1°, that they are not in the Peschito, and some other ancient versions; 2°, the author signs himself the *ancient*, who is alleged not to have been St. John, the Apostle; and 3°, Origen, Eusebius, and St. Jerome are very guarded in their observations regarding the genuineness of these New Testament books. But this dubious attitude of these eminent authorities was, doubtless, due to the remarkable brevity of these Epistles, which are not found in some of the later copies of the Peschito, but this does not prove that they are wanting in the earlier copies of this celebrated Syriac version, especially as they are given in such an old version as the *Vetus Italica*, and in so early a canon as that of Muratori (A.D. 175). And as to the argument from the signature of “*the ancient*,” so far from weakening, it strengthens immensely the genuineness of these Epistles for St. John, the Evangelist, lived to a very old age—long after the other Apostles had gone to their reward—and he was consequently *the ancient* or senior amongst those immediately succeeding the time of the Apostles.

EPISTLE OF ST. JUDE :—Anti-Catholic authorities also pronounce this deutero-canonical book of the New Testament spurious, because it is not quoted by

any of the prominent writers of the Eastern or Western Church until the fourth century. Subsequently, when St. Clement, of Alexandria, St. Jerome, and Origen, noticed it, they did so with manifest misgivings. Again the writer seems to convey that he lived after all the Apostles had passed away, for he says :—"But you, my dearly beloved, be mindful of the words which have been spoken before by the Apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ" (Jude i. 17). And that the writer was not the Apostle St. Jude, seems to be further confirmed by his doing what an Apostle neither would, nor could be accused of, namely, quoting not only from the Book of Enoch, but also from another apocryphal Scripture, "the Assumption of Moses" where he found the story of the Archangel Michael's combat with the devil for the possession of the body of Moses. But 1°, the earliest writers of the Eastern and Western Church make no mention of St. Jude's Epistle, for the simple reason that it consisted of one chapter only, and even in that there was nothing to call for their special attention. 2°. The hesitating tone which later Fathers adopted towards this Epistle arose from their doubts respecting its canonicity and not its genuineness. 3°. The expression, "Apostles of our Lord," is intended by St. Jude to apply to SS. Peter and Paul, and other Apostles, who had just won their crown of martyrdom in circumstances of great triumph for the infant Church, whence

St. Jude takes the opportunity of exhorting the faithful "to be mindful of their words." Thus it happened that the place held by several of the deutero-canonical Scriptures on the canon escaped the notice of a few early Christian writers, while suspicion hardly ever touched the question of their genuineness.

THE APOCALYPSE:—The arguments against the genuineness of this, the last book of the New Testament Scriptures, are, 1°, that in Greek copies it is ascribed to St. John, the theologian, and not to St. John, *the Apostle*; 2° that it is not mentioned by any writer of the Apostolic age; and 3°, that soon after the first few centuries of the Church, St. Dionysius, of Alexandria, speaks of it as not the work of St. John, while St. Jerome, in his Epistle to Dardanus, says the Greek Fathers did not believe it to be a genuine production, and consequently never gave it a place in any of their canons. For these reasons, and because it is totally different in phraseology from St. John's other acknowledged writings, the belief in his authorship of it is rejected by many outside the Catholic Church. In answer to these objections it is to be observed, 1°, that St. John earned the name of the theologian on account of the marked doctrinal character of his Gospel. 2°. The statement of Dionysius, of Alexandria, even if well founded, does not represent the authority of all the early Christian writers. There is no doubt,

whatever, that the Greek Fathers declined, as St. Jerome wrote to Dardanus, to recognise the genuineness and canonicity of the Apocalypse. But this arose from a holy fear that this book should favour in any way the foul doctrine to which its 4th verse, chapter xx., was prostituted by the Millenarian or Chiliast heretics, namely, that the martyrs would reign a thousand years before the end of the world with Christ in the enjoyment of carnal delights. 3°. As regards the apparent difference of style it must be noticed that prophecy, more than any other subject, has a vocabulary of its own, and therefore, it is to be expected that his *revelation* would be told by St. John in phraseology somewhat different from that adopted by him elsewhere.

I. AND II. CHAPTERS OF ST. MATTHEW'S GOSPEL :—
The interpolation of this particular part of the first Gospel is maintained by not a few outside the Catholic Church, for the reason that these chapters do not appear in the oldest existing copy of this Scripture, and the matter they treat of is not touched upon by St. Mark, though his Gospel is, to a great extent, a compendium of St. Matthew's. But 1°, to produce this, the most ancient copy of St. Matthew's Gospel, is to appeal to the authority of heretics, known as the Ebionites, who denied the Incarnation, and consequently eliminated from their copy of St. Matthew these two chapters, where this mystery is so clearly and so prominently put

forward. 2°. St. Mark's object appears to have been to give an epitome of what St. Matthew had already written, and he passed over the subject of these two chapters just as he did the Sermon upon the Mount.

ST. MARK'S GOSPEL, XVI. 8-20 :—These thirteen verses are also brought forward as the work of a strange hand, because 1°, they do not appear, it is said, in either the Vatican or Sinaitic Codices, and St. Jerome, Eusebius, and St. Gregory of Nyssa, declare they could not find this part of St. Mark's Gospel in any of the New Testament manuscript copies, belonging to the first three centuries. Then it is wanting in the Armenian and Arabic versions as well as in the *Vetus Italica* (Old Latin) version, or rather in a rare copy of it, discovered in the monastery of Bobbio ; 2°, the style of the alleged interpolation is said to differ widely from the rest of St. Mark's Gospel ; and 3°, if St. Mark was the author of this passage, he would not, as he does in the 9th verse, state the reverse of what St. Matthew records in the 1st verse, chapter xxviii. of his Gospel. But 1°, in the matter of New Testament copies of the originals, Mill, Bengel, Wettstein, are, perhaps, unsurpassed in critical authority, and they have retained these disputed verses of St. Mark in their respective editions of the Greek Testament. Then as to ancient versions, the weight of evidence is in favour of St. Mark being the author of this passage,

since it is found in the Peshito, the Vulgate, and in all the copies of the Old Latin version, except this one discovered in the Monastery of Bobbio ; in short, it is to be seen in the bulk of ancient versions, and in all the ancient liturgies. 2°, the supposed peculiarity of diction is wholly imaginary, as is also the contradiction between the 9th verse, chapter xvi. of St. Mark's Gospel :—" But he rising early the first day of the week, appeared first to Mary Magdalen, out of whom he had cast seven devils," and the 1st verse, chapter xxviii. of St. Matthew's Gospel :—" And in the end of the Sabbath, when it began to dawn towards the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalen, and the other Mary to see the sepulchre." Here St. Matthew distinctly mentions the time of this tender episode to be "in the end of the Sabbath," and between this and St. Mark's "first day of the week, there is a perfect agreement, for the Jewish Sabbath, which began Friday evening, ended on Sunday morning, "the first day of the week." Then when St. Mark says "the sun being now risen," he refers to the time when the two Marys and Salome had actually reached the sepulchre, whereas St. Matthew's words, "when it began to dawn," fix the time when these pious women left home to pay their loving tribute of affection at the tomb of their Saviour.

ST. LUKE'S GOSPEL, XXII. 43, 44 :—There are Protestant critics who contend that the narrative

contained in this part of St. Luke's Gospel was a subsequent addition to the original. They pretend the statement which represents Jesus to be so overwhelmed with anguish as to need a comforter, is incompatible with His divinity, and that it would be impossible for His human nature to support the terrible strain, implied in the sweat of blood. 2°. The incident, they say, is not recorded in most copies of the New Testament originals, notably the Vatican and Alexandrian manuscripts. But this vivid description of our Blessed Lord's agony in the garden, has reference not to His divine but true human nature, and it is not incompatible with the human nature of Jesus that he should be weighed down by overwhelming sorrow in the manner here mentioned by St. Luke. The fact only proves that our Lord had a true human nature, and medical testimony in no way contravenes the assertion of the sacred penman. 2°. The absence of these two verses from ancient copies is accounted for by St. Jerome, who remarks that some copyists suppressed the words of the text in their manuscripts lest they might be turned to account by the enemies of our Blessed Lord's divinity.

GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN VIII. 1-11:—Protestant critics insist also that these eleven verses belong to an author other than St. John, because 1°, they are not in keeping with the context; and 2°, they do not appear in many ancient copies and versions.

The first argument, however, is an unfounded assertion, as an examination of the context will show. Jesus is in Jerusalem teaching the crowds, gathered there for the feast of Tabernacles. The numbers attracted by Him are so great that the jealous Pharisees conspire to entrap Him into some breach of the law so as to weaken His authority with the people, and this they tried to effect by the stragem, related by St. Luke, which, therefore, fits in with the preceding narrative. 2°. St. Augustine has accounted for the disappearance of this passage by attributing it to an intentional act on the part of some pious copyists, who thought they ought to remove what they feared would encourage the faithful to commit adultery with impunity. This mistaken zeal St. Augustine condemned, saying that Jesus significantly added, "Go, and now sin no more."

GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN XXI.:—These deuterocanonical passages of the New Testament are not the only ones which have received the censure of Protestant critics: They would expunge the 21st or last chapter of St. John's Gospel, and their ground for doing so is that the Evangelist concluded chapter xx. as follows:—"Many other signs also did Jesus in the sight of His disciples, which are not written in this book. But these are written, that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God: and that believing, you may have life in His name."

That these were the last words of this Gospel, no one, they say, can doubt, and yet they are followed immediately by another chapter (xxi.), which it might be argued cannot belong to St. John. To this it may be said that the words quoted do not clearly indicate any intention on the part of the sacred writer to conclude his Gospel, whereas the final passage of chapter xxi. is evidently the close of the narrative.

I. EPISTLE OF ST. JOHN V. 7 :—The Socinians, and the more modern Unitarians, who deny the divinity of Jesus Christ, assert that this seventh verse is interpolated. Yet the words are read in all the more recent, and in almost all the ancient manuscripts of the *Latin Vulgate*. There are also good grounds for concluding that St. Jerome himself, when engaged upon the translation of the Vulgate, inserted this passage in his own copy; for the Fulda MS., written in 546 by Vincent of Capua, contains a prologue by St. Jerome in which he defends the genuineness of this verse. Now, it has been proved that as a witness of the state of the original text, the *Vulgate* is far more reliable than any existing Greek Testament copy or version, with or without the controverted passage. It is true that this seventh verse is not to be found in the Vatican, Alexandrian, Sinaitic, and other early Greek codices. But the explanation usually given seems quite reasonable, namely, that the omission by the copyist in

the case of these ancient Greek manuscripts, was due to the apparent similarity between the 7th and 8th verses, which thus led him to pass over the former verse as having been copied. The copies with this omission were the only ones available to many of the distinguished scholars, who fought the battle of the Church against the Arians, and hence they could not have quoted this seventh verse, no matter how important it was for their argument. Such then were the assaults persistently made by the enemy on the Sacred canon. They have, however, been successfully repelled at every stage by the Catholic Church, and thus she has secured to her children, with infallible certainty, God's written word, no more and no less than was handed down from the Apostles.





CHAPTER IX.

INTERPRETATION OF THE SACRED SCRIPTURES.

The Holy Ghost has committed to the teaching-body of the Church the true meaning of every Scripture word and sentence, bearing upon faith and morals—This declared by the Council of Trent, and affirmed in the Vatican Council—In publishing this sense the Church bears witness to the fact that such was the interpretation received by the Christian community everywhere from the beginning—What was believed in the Church *everywhere, always and by all*, has come from the teaching of Christ and His Apostles—The testimony of the Church to the existence of this uniform and general belief is infallible—The Church testifies to the faith of the Christian community *directly* and *indirectly*—The true sense of the Scripture may be ascertained, but not with unerring certainty, by the science of Sacred *Hermeneutics*—Usage of Language—Examination of the Context—Parallelism—The *literal* and *mystical* sense of the Scripture—Anti-Catholics, as a rule, deny that any mystical or spiritual sense is to be found distinct from the literal sense in the Bible—*Exegesis*, or the science of making known the true sense of the Scriptures—The system of *accommodation*—Anti-Catholic systems of Biblical interpretation—Evangelicals and Calvinists claim an internal illustration of the Holy Spirit—Protestants generally hold that each individual is quite capable by his own light of discovering the true meaning of God's written word.

INTERPRETATION OF THE SACRED SCRIPTURES:—
The Holy Ghost, as principal Author of all the books on the Canon, has committed to the teaching-body of the Church the power of arriving at the true sense of every Scriptural word and sentence, bearing

upon faith and morals. The Council of Trent defined this three hundred years ago, and its solemn pronouncement has been affirmed (1870), by the Vatican Council in the following words:—And as the “things which the Holy Synod of Trent decreed, soundly concerning the interpretation of Divine Scripture, in order to curb rebellious spirits, have been wrongly explained by some men, We renewing the said Decree, declare this to be their sense, That in matters of faith and morals appertaining to the edification of Christian faith and doctrine, that is to be held as the true sense of Holy Scripture, which Holy Mother Church hath held and holds, to whom it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Holy Scripture; and, therefore, that it is permitted to no one to interpret the Sacred Scripture contrary to this sense, or even contrary to the unanimous consent of the Fathers” (Dogmatic Constitution on the Catholic Faith, chap. ii. of Revelation).

It is, therefore an article of Catholic faith that the Church has from the Holy Ghost the power of interpreting whatever there is in the Bible of faith and morals. In declaring this sense the Church does nothing more than bear witness to the fact that such was the acceptation received by the entire Christian community from the beginning. Now it is a fundamental principle, that what was believed in the Church, everywhere, always, and by all (*quod*

ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditur), must have emanated from the teaching of Christ or His Apostles. The testimony of the Church to the existence of this uniform and general belief is infallible inasmuch as it rests upon the assistance of the Holy Ghost:—"But the Paraclete, the Holy Ghost, "whom the Father will send in my name, he will "teach you all things, and bring all things to your "mind, whatsoever I shall have said to you" (Gospel of St. John xiv. 26).

How does the Church testify to this faith of the Christian community from its inception? 1°, *directly* by solemnly publishing, under pain of heresy, the meaning to be attached to a disputed passage. Thus when the so-called Reformers of the sixteenth century controverted the Catholic interpretation of our Lord's well-known words on the Sacrament of Penance in St. John's Gospel (xx. 22, 23), the Council of Trent decreed:—"If anyone saith, "that those words of the Lord, the Saviour, " 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost, whose sins you shall "forgive they are forgiven them, and whose sins "you shall retain, they are retained,' are not to be "understood of the power of forgiving sins in the "Sacrament of penance, as the Catholic Church *has* " *always from the beginning understood them*; but "wrests them, contrary to the institution of this "Sacrament, to the power of preaching the Gospel; "let him be anathema." (Session xiv., Canon iii.)

2°, *indirectly*, when the Church testifies to this Christian belief by appealing to the morally unanimous consent of the Fathers as witnesses of the interpretation that prevailed, down to their time, throughout the household of faith. The sense which they proclaim was, beyond doubt, the true one *then*, and because the faith of Christ never changes it must be so *now*. The Fathers of the Vatican Council, like their predecessors of Trent, decreed that the Sacred Scriptures shall be always interpreted strictly in accordance "with the true sense which Holy Mother Church hath held and holds, . . . and, therefore, that it is permitted to no one to interpret the Sacred Scripture contrary to their sense, or even contrary to the unanimous consent of the Fathers." 3° The Church also proposes indirectly the true sense of God's written word by *the analogy of faith*, that is, the essential unity that joins together the whole body of her divine doctrines. This is the principle that renders false any Biblical interpretation which may be found to contradict a point of Catholic faith.

HERMENEUTICS:—It is only by this teaching of the Church, contained in the belief of the whole Christian community from the beginning, and proclaimed by her definitive judgment or gathered from the unanimous consent of the Fathers, that the true sense of the Scripture can be discovered in such a manner as to exclude all possibility of doubt. The same sense may be ascertained, not, however, with

the same unerring certainty, by making use of those purely human critical tests for arriving at the meaning of the sacred text. These constitute what is known as the science of Hermeneutics from the Greek *ερμηνευω* to explain, and among its rules the first is *the usage of language*. This consists in grasping thoroughly the meaning, which the principal Author of the Sacred Scriptures wished to convey through the language employed. To discover this sense correctly one must 1°, be acquainted with the Hebrew, Chaldaic and Greek of the originals, as well as the cognate languages. A knowledge of Latin is not enough, because the Vulgate, though an authentic translation, does not reflect the full force of the originals; 2°, the signification attached to the words of these ancient languages at the time they were written must be ascertained as far as possible. This is the more necessary, because the people, then addressed, understood some well-known Biblical terms in a manner different from their posterity, just as the present generation in these countries gives to some English words quite another meaning from that attached to them by their ancestors of even a hundred years ago.

The examination of the context is a second most important law in the science of Hermeneutics. A skilful author will endeavour to arrange his matter so that the thoughts appear to grow out of each other. This is what is known as logical

sequence, and we must expect to find it in absolute perfection in the Scripture. Hence, by tracing this mutual relation of one sentence with another in Holy writ, the true sense will be brought to light and stamped with all the security that this human aid is capable of giving.

When this examination of the context and the usage of language will not suffice, parallelism may be usefully applied. Thus it often happens that the same thoughts, and even the same words recur in various parts of the Bible. These are called parallel passages, and when closely compared, the result is sure, though not infallibly, to lead to the true meaning. The *concordance* of the Latin Vulgate exhibits at a glance these parallel passages, so that they are easily collated.

In arriving at the true sense of the Scripture, valuable assistance may be derived, too, from a careful consideration of the attendant circumstances, namely, the character of the audience, the occasion that gave rise to the discourse, as well as its scope. These and other scientific rules of Biblical interpretation are not ignored in the Catholic Church. They are as dear to Catholics as to the Protestants of every shade, and in employing them on the Sacred text, a Catholic exercises the same liberty of interpretation as the Protestant. While, however, Catholics diligently and profitably apply all these laws of Sacred Hermeneutics they are infallibly

secured by the Holy Ghost, speaking through His teaching Church, from straying out of the right path that leads to the true meaning of the text.

THE SENSE OF THE SACRED SCRIPTURE :—Under the influence of this divine light, which guides the teaching Church, Catholics are enabled to determine, without danger of error, the literal as well as the spiritual or mystical signification of God's written word.

THE LITERAL SENSE OF THE BIBLE :—The literal sense is the simple, original signification, which belongs to the letter of the Bible, like any other book. A word or sentence in this literal signification is sometimes used by the Holy Ghost as a figure of another thing to which it has a resemblance. As, for example, when the Sacred writer designated Jesus as *the Lamb of God* (John i. 29), he means that, because of its innocence and meekness, the lamb is a figure of the Saviour.

THE MYSTICAL OR SPIRITUAL SENSE OF THE BIBLE :—The sense which is now and then, not always, hidden beneath the *literal* signification of the word or words of the Sacred text, is the mystical or spiritual sense, and occurs, in the use of the word Jerusalem, which is literally the capital of Judæa ; but mystically heaven, the home of the blessed. Anti-Catholics, as a rule, deny that any spiritual sense is to be found, distinct from the literal, in the Bible. But the existence of this mystical sense, in

many parts of the Old Testament, is certified by St. Paul. Thus he declares in his first Epistle to the Corinthians, that the things, which happened to the Israelites in the Red Sea, and in the desert were "done in a figure of us" (x. 6). Again, in his Epistle to the Hebrews, he states, unequivocally, that the whole of the Old Law was a figure of the new dispensation :—"For the law having a shadow "of the good things to come, not the very image of "the things; by the self-same sacrifices, which "they offer continually every year, can never make "the comers thereunto perfect" (x. 1). Much, therefore, of the old Testament, has a spiritual sense, because, as St. Augustine says:—"The Old Testament is the promise in figure." Now, since this mystical sense is that which is hidden under the letter, every passage with a spiritual sense has also a literal one; but that any word or sentence has more than one literal sense, is not admitted by Catholic authorities generally.

EXEGESIS :—Having thus obtained the true meaning of the Scriptures, the next step is to make this meaning intelligible to others. This is the office of Exegesis, which bears the same relation to Hermeneutics as practice does to theory, and consists in expounding the true sense of the Scriptures, which is done chiefly by commentators. Preachers often travel outside the province of Exegesis when they apply the words of Scripture to every-day matters,

which do not belong either to the literal or mystical sense. It is known as the system of *accommodation* in Scripture, for it accommodates the Sacred text to subjects not treated therein.

ANTI-CATHOLIC SYSTEMS OF BIBLICAL INTERPRETATION:—Evangelicals and Calvinists claim an internal illustration of the Holy Spirit to instruct them in the true meaning of every Scriptural doctrine, necessary for salvation. This is a strange imitation of the infallible principle of Catholic interpretation; but the great body of Protestants hold the doctrine that each individual is quite capable by his own lights of discovering the true sense of God's written word. To rest Christian faith, however, on man's own impressions or convictions is to know little of the wild vagaries of the human mind, and to forget the fate of the primitive revelation among the bulk of mankind.





CHAPTER X.

AUTHORITY OF THE LATIN VULGATE AND THE READING OF THE BIBLE IN THE VERNACULAR.

That the Latin Vulgate is an *authentic* translation solemnly defined by Catholic Church—What Catholics are obliged to believe by this—The Latin Vulgate by this not elevated above the originals or ancient versions—Latin Vulgate identified—Its revision—It alone lawfully used in Catholic liturgy and worship—From it alone translations into the people's language must be made—It has been pronounced by Protestants not to be faithful to the originals—They set it aside and profess to make their versions direct from the Hebrew and Greek texts—It represents Hebrew and Greek copies nearer in point of age to the originals than any existing manuscript copies—Safer to follow the Vulgate than modern translations, made from existing copies of originals—Perversion of Catholic meaning of inspired text in Protestant versions—Instances of this in Luther's and Beza's translations as well as in the English Protestant versions—Catholic doctrine on the reading the Scriptures by the faithful—Well expressed by Dr. Dixon—Conditions imposed by Catholic Church for reading the Bible in the mother-tongue.

CATHOLICS AND THE LATIN VULGATE :—Catholics hold as an article of faith that the Latin Vulgate is an *authentic* translation of God's written word, that is, they believe with infallible certainty that the Latin Vulgate is free from the taint of corruption, so that between it and the originals there is no ma-

terial difference. This is what the Council of Trent solemnly affirmed in the following words :—“ More-
“ over the same Sacred and holy Synod, considering
“ that no small utility may accrue to the Church of
“ God, if it be made known which out of all the
“ Latin editions now in circulation of the Sacred
“ Books is to be held as *authentic*, ordains and de-
“ clares that the said old and Vulgate edition, which
“ by the lengthened usage of so many ages has
“ been approved of in the Church, be in public lec-
“ tures, disputations, sermons, and expositions held
“ as *authentic*, and that no one is to dare to reject it
“ under any pretence whatever.” (Session IV.,
Decree concerning the edition and the use of the
sacred books.)

In this decree it is not defined either that the Latin Vulgate is an immaculate translation, or more perfect than any other version, or equal to the originals themselves. The Council has even made public profession to the contrary ; for after the Fathers had just solemnly pronounced the Vulgate to be *authentic*, they directed that “ henceforth the
“ Sacred Scripture, and especially the said old Vul-
“ gate edition, be printed in the most correct manner
“ possible.” This supposes that there were errors then existing to be corrected and will be henceforth, though not of a serious character. Now these cannot be detected without a knowledge of the ancient languages in which the Scripture originals

were written, and also of those into which it was translated. It follows that, so far from elevating the Vulgate above the originals or any other ancient versions, the Tridentine Fathers have made it dependent for its revision on the study not only of the languages of the original, but of those of the ancient versions. At the same time, in the words of the decree just quoted, the Vulgate is contrasted with the Latin versions then in circulation, and is identified as:—"the old and Vulgate edition which has been "approved by the long use of so many ages in the "Church," that is St. Jerome's Latin text of the Bible which was called *Vulgate* in the seventh century, because as St. Isidore of Seville (630) says, it was then in common use throughout the whole Church "*generaliter omnes Ecclesie usquequaque utuntur.*"

The Fathers of the Council of Trent by no means authorize every one who may possess a knowledge of the ancient languages to engage in the correction of the Vulgate, and Pope Clement VIII. positively forbids any such attempt to be made, unless by one commissioned by the Church. In the Bull attached to his own revised edition, he says:—"Let the "Vulgate edition be read in all the Churches without the least particle being added or taken away." When, therefore, the Council of Trent commanded the Vulgate edition to be first corrected, and then printed, no uninvited person or persons dared to carry out this ordinance; but two great Popes in

succession, namely, Sixtus V. and Clement VIII., employed upon the work the services of the most eminent Biblical scholars of the time, like Caraffa and Bellarmine. When Sixtus V. brought out his edition in 1590, it came to be considered unsatisfactory, so that the revision of the Vulgate was resumed by orders of Clement VIII., and having extended, with interruptions, over a period of forty years, it was happily brought to a close in 1592, by this illustrious Pope, who published the Vulgate Bible, which bears his name.

Lastly, the Fathers of the Council of Trent in this Decree ordain:—"That the said old and "Vulgate edition, be in public lectures, disputations, "sermons, and expositions held as authentic." Thus the Catholic Church has solemnly approved of the Latin Vulgate, that it alone may be lawfully used in her liturgy and worship. No priest, therefore, officiating in his public capacity, can use a translation made by himself from the Hebrew and Greek, and no Catholic layman is free to read a translation of the whole Bible into the vernacular unless it be taken from the Latin Vulgate. This is confirmed by the practice of the Church since the Decree of the Council of Trent in giving her approbation to vernacular translations of the Bible, only when they are in strict conformity to the Latin Vulgate.

PROTESTANTS AND THE LATIN VULGATE:—In the sixteenth century, when the founders of Pro-

testantism were met by the authority of the Vulgate, they said that this translation did not faithfully represent the originals. Accordingly they professed to set it aside, and to make their versions direct from the Hebrew and Greek text. But the Latin Vulgate text is 600 years older than any existing copy of the Hebrew original, and 200 years earlier than the date of any known manuscript of the Greek text. The Latin Vulgate, therefore, represents Hebrew and Greek copies, nearer by far, in point of age, to the originals, than any of the manuscripts, which were to be found in the sixteenth century or have since been discovered. Therefore in determining the correct meaning of the Scripture text there will be greater certainty of arriving at the true sense of what was first written by following the Latin Vulgate, which was derived from the most ancient copies of the originals, at a time when the text was more pure, and the Hebrew and Greek better understood, than by adopting as a guide those versions taken by Protestants from comparatively modern copies, and made when the knowledge of the Hebrew and Greek of the originals was undoubtedly less perfect.

Then the most prominent among the authors of these Protestant versions did not hesitate at times to corrupt the sacred text in their translations to make it favour their new doctrines. For instance, in his German translation of the well-known

text from St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans:—
“For we account a man to be justified by faith
“without the works of the law” (Romans iii. 28),
Luther inserted the word, ‘alone,’ after ‘justified,’ to
establish his anti-Catholic teaching of the sufficiency
of faith for justification. Upon being remonstrated
with for this interpolation he replied:—“So I will, so
“I command, let my wish stand for the reason. The
“word, alone, must remain in my New Testament,
“although all the Papists run mad, they shall not
“take it from thence. It grieves me that I did not
“add also those other two words without all works
“of all laws.”

Theodore Beza, the immediate successor of Calvin
as head of the Swiss Protestants (1564), translated
the Greek Testament into Latin, and his mode of
altering the original to give colour to his Calvinistic
notions is well described by Dr. MacKnight, a Pro-
testant writer of acknowledged authority. In the
preface to his Commentary on the Epistles, he says:—
“He (Beza) hath mistranslated a number of texts
“for the purpose, it would seem, of establishing his
“peculiar doctrines and confuting his opponents.
“Further by omitting some of the original words,
“and by adding others without any necessity, he
“hath, in his translation, perverted, or at least
“darkened some passages, so that to speak impar-
“tially his translation is neither literal, faithful, nor
“perspicuous. Nevertheless, Beza having acquired

“great fame, both as a linguist and as a divine, the
 “learned men who afterwards translated the New
 “Testament for the use of the reformed Churches
 “were too much swayed by his opinions.”

In the first Protestant translations of the Bible into English by Tyndale and Coverdale (1530 and 1535), the original word *εἰδωλον* (idol) (2 Corinthians vi. 16, and 1st Epistle of St. John v. 21) is turned into image. This erroneous rendering, directed no doubt, against the Catholic use and veneration of images, was repeated in the *Geneva Bible* (1557) as well as in *the Bishop's Bible* (1568). With the same anti-Catholic object the original words *ἐκκλησια* (church) and *Θυσιαστηριον* (altar) were translated into congregation and temple. And in the Authorised Version (1605) the Catholic practice of receiving holy communion in one kind is insidiously attacked by having the Greek *η* literally *or*, translated into *and*. “The meaning of this *η*,” writes Dean Alford, “is not to be changed to *και*, as is most unfairly done “in our English Version, and the completeness “of the argument thereby destroyed.” And Dean Stanley, another Protestant authority, on 1 Corinth. (xi. 27) note, p. 202, says:—“Probably “from the wish to accommodate the text to the “change of custom, or from hostility to the Roman “Catholic practice of administering the bread with- “out the cup, the English translators have *unwar-* “*rantly* rendered *η*, ‘and,’ *και* for *η* occurs only in

“A. and in three cursive MSS.” It is right to state that this rendering has been corrected in the revision of the Authorized Version (Cambridge, 1881), and is made to read thus:—“Wherefore, whoever “shall eat the bread *or* drink the cup of the Lord “unworthily shall be guilty of the body and blood “of the Lord.”

CATHOLIC CHURCH AND THE READING OF THE BIBLE IN THE MOTHER-TONGUE:—It is an essential part of Catholic doctrine that the reading of the Scriptures in their own language is not necessary for the faithful in order to know what they are bound to believe and practise to gain eternal life. This knowledge they can and must receive by divine arrangement, from authorized teachers, whom God has provided in His Church:—“As to the simple faithful,” says the learned Dr. Dixon, “the rule in the Christian “Church has always been that they should learn the “doctrines of religion and their duty to God, by “means of the instructions of the constituted teachers “in the Church. The private study or perusal of “the sacred volume has never been obligatory upon “them.” (General Introduction to Sacred Scriptures, Vol. I., p. 228.) At the same time the pious and well-instructed are earnestly exhorted to procure the Bible and to read it in the language they understand best, and to foster this Catholic practice the publication of cheap translations of the Bible is warmly encouraged by the Holy See.

From the history of the Scripture versions in another chapter no one can doubt that at a very early period it was common in the Catholic Church to have the Bible turned into the languages of the various peoples, who came into her fold. After the invention of printing, a great number of these vernacular translations spread over the West, as is shown by the circulation of twenty-three German translations, and more than fifty other versions in the various European idioms, long before Luther published his German Protestant version. Thus the use of translations in the native tongues was adopted by the Church as *good* and *useful*, but a time came when this good and useful practice was abused. It has been shown that Luther availed himself of it to try to sap the foundation of the Catholic faith, and that his example was followed by other notorious propagandists of heterodox opinions. The Church, believing that Christ confided to her trust, His saving doctrines, was bound to prevent these truths from the danger of being lost or even obscured through means of versions of the Scriptures, in which the true meaning was intentionally distorted with the avowed object of putting it into opposition with what is most sacred in Catholic belief. This she did in *the Rules of the Index* (No. 4), drawn up at the Council of Trent, where it is set down authoritatively:—"Since experience has made it manifest that the reading of

“ the Bible in the vulgar tongue, if it is permitted
“ to all indiscriminately, causes, through the
“ temerity of men, more detriment than utility,
“ let the judgment of the bishops or the inquisitor
“ be followed in the matter, who, with the advice of
“ the parish priest or confessor, can permit the
“ reading of these versions in the vulgar tongue,
“ that have been made by *Catholic authors*, to those
“ whom they shall know to be fit to derive from
“ this reading not detriment, but an increase
“ of faith and piety—and let this permission be in
“ writing.”

In June, 1757, the congregation of the Index, under Pope Benedict XIV., not only confirmed this fourth rule of the Council of Trent, but added to it the following clause:—“ These versions of the
“ Bible in the vulgar tongue are permitted, when
“ they have been approved by the Holy See, or are
“ published with notes drawn from the Holy
“ Fathers, or from learned Catholic writers.” Thus to render a version in the native language accessible to the faithful, it is not enough that it be the work of a Catholic, and sanctioned by episcopal authority. It must be furnished also with notes explaining those obscure and difficult passages, which ordinary readers may “wrest to their own destruction” (2nd Epistle of St. Peter iii. 15). Hence it is perfectly legitimate for Catholics to read any vernacular translation of the Sacred Scrip-

tures made from the Latin Vulgate by a Catholic, furnished with explanatory notes, and having the episcopal sanction, or the approbation of the Holy See, though this latter is not needed, nor has it been actually accorded to most of the Catholic versions of the Bible in the modern languages. The action of the Church in this matter is wise and practical, and is, moreover, analogous to the course pursued by the civil authority ; for the State visits with punishment the publication and circulation of seditious and indecent books to save her subjects from being corrupted in their duties as good citizens, and yet the State cannot be said to proscribe the diffusion of *sound* literature. So the Catholic Church, in the faithful discharge of her sacred office, has subjected to *restriction* the vernacular versions of the Bible in order to prevent the circulation of any which might be directed to undermine the faith of her people.





CHAPTER XI.

THE BOOK OF GENESIS AND NATURAL SCIENCE.

I. MOSAIC AGE OF THE WORLD :—Day—Morning and Evening—Catholics free to hold that the six days of Moses indicate six great Epochs—Demands of Geology satisfied.

II. MOSAIC ANTIQUITY OF MAN :—The age of man, as given in Genesis—Though not bound to accept this total as necessarily complete Catholics hold that Science has not proved the age of man to exceed this computation—Examination of the arguments from Geology, Philology, and Chronology against this.

III. MOSAIC ORIGIN OF PLANTS AND ANIMALS :—That each species of plants and animals had an independent origin, apparently taught in Genesis—This, though not declared by the Church, is believed by Catholics to be the true sense of the words of Moses—Darwin's theory in his "Origin of Species."

IV. MOSAIC ORIGIN OF MAN :—Creation of man's body—Creation of man's soul—Darwin's views on the origin of man.

V. ORIGINAL UNITY OF THE HUMAN RACE :—Every man who came into the world since Adam is descended from him—Pre-Adamite heresy—Examination of arguments against unity of the human race.

VI. THE DELUGE—The fact that God sent the Flood upon the earth is inspired—It is denied by some—*Absolute* universality of the Flood, though not defined by the Church, is Catholic teaching—Examination of the arguments of Sceptics against it.

I. MOSAIC AGE OF THE WORLD :—Belief and unbelief have fought so long and so desperately over the history of the creation, that the Book of Genesis, wherein it is contained, may be well considered the battle-field of the Bible. It is the religious controversy that is occupying public

attention at present, more than at any time in the world's history, and men, professing the principles of Christianity, have been found to range themselves on the side of those, who refuse to recognise in this part of the Sacred Scriptures the unerring word of God.

“In the beginning God created heaven and earth. And the earth was void and empty, and darkness was upon the face of the deep, and the Spirit of God moved over the waters” (Genesis i. 1, 2). Such are the terms in which Moses relates the creation of the universe, and he then proceeds to tell in succession that “God made” the light and heat, which are necessary to render the globe habitable; also “the firmament for dividing the waters from the waters;” the vegetable world; the fishes and the birds; “cattle and creeping things, and beasts of the earth;” and last, but not least, he says:—“That God created man to His own image, to the image of God He created him, male and female He created them” (Genesis i. 27).

The Sacred writer uses the word *Day*; but that he meant by it to denote a space of indeterminate duration has been taught by the Venerable Bede in his commentary on this passage:—“It is manifest that in this place the Sacred writer has put the word *Day* for all that time during which the primeval creation was brought into existence. For it was not upon one of the six days that the

“sky was made and adorned with stars, and the
“dry land was separated from the waters, and
“furnished with trees and plants. But, according
“to its accustomed practice, Scripture here uses the
“word *Day* in the sense of time.” Then as the
day opens with the morning, and closes with the
evening, Moses employed these terms to indicate
the beginning and ending of the different stages,
accomplished by the Divine Architect in preparing
here below a temporary home for man.

In all this Mosaic account of the creation there is
nothing but what is infallibly certain, for infalli-
bility is an essential part of the inspiration, which
the sacred writer undoubtedly possessed. There are,
however, some outside the Catholic Church who
refuse to accept the truth of this record, on the
ground that it does not harmonize with the theories,
based upon the recent investigations of the strata
beneath the earth's surface. It has been ascer-
tained, they say, that these formations are the
growth not of six days, but of countless ages.
It is, however, to be noted that wherever in the
Bible any statement occurs touching history, geo-
graphy, or any branch of natural science, the
Catholic Church invariably leaves the meaning of
the expression employed to be determined by ordi-
nary human lights. But since these parts of the
Sacred Scripture, like those that relate to doctrine,
are covered by inspiration, the Church insists that

the *scientific* explanation put upon them shall neither clash with any *certain* discovery in nature, nor create a direct contradiction between one inspired writer and another. Catholics are perfectly free, therefore, to hold that Moses, by these *six days*, did not mean six ordinary days of twenty-four hours each, but six great epochs, corresponding with the successive stages which seem to be reflected in the life of the globe. Geologists, relying on the vegetable and animal remains, imbedded in the rocks, require vast spaces of time for the necessarily tedious and gradual development of the various layers where these relics of the past are found; and this geological demand is amply satisfied by the long periods to which these days of Genesis may be expanded.

Moses, in this description of how all things came into existence, proposes to teach his people such truths as would save them from their besetting sin of giving to creatures the supreme worship that belonged to God alone. With this object he told them that the whole world, with its manifold and teeming life, came from God, and not from any self-existing principle, or by chance. Consequently, to pay divine honour either to the stones, brutes, and men on the earth, or to the sun, moon and stars in the sky, would be an insult to the Creator and Sovereign Lord of these things, as well as a flagrant violation of the fundamental doctrine of the true religion, namely, the unity of God. In explaining

this, Moses did not speak above the intelligence of those whom he addressed, by making use of the language of scientific terminology. Still all his statements touching the origin of things, are perfectly consistent, and have never been proved to contain error.

II. THE MOSAIC ANTIQUITY OF MAN :—Moses has not left the age of the human race undefined as he did that of the world. In the fifth and eleventh chapters of Genesis the genealogical succession is duly registered with the number of years from Adam to Noe, and from Noe to Abraham, which, according to the Latin Vulgate, amounts to a period of 2,021 years. The Septuagint or ancient Greek version fixes the number at 3,387 years. Now, taking even the longer of these two periods, and adding some 2,000 years for the interval between the call of Abraham and the birth of Christ, together with the 1889 of the Christian era, the present age of man, as given in Genesis, is not quite 8,000 years. Though Catholics are not bound by any solemn decree of the Church to accept this total of 8,000 years as necessarily complete, still they hold that the evidence produced by science on the matter does not prove the age of man to exceed this computation.

Some Geologists maintain that 200,000 years and more would not suffice to bake the “drift” lately explored in a few caves of Great Britain and elsewhere. Yet man, they say, must have trodden the

original soil upon which these deposits rest, since they exhibit unmistakable evidence of his existence in the shape of rough weapons and implements, made by his hands. Other Geologists, however, from the same facts arrive at a different conclusion.

These rude specimens have also furnished an argument to some Geologists for believing that at the time they were made man was roaming wild over the earth, and that it took tens of thousands of years to lift him out of barbarism to the state of civilization, represented by the neat workmanship exhibited in the bronze and iron tools lying in later deposits of the earth. Now if this were true it would follow that man was created in a savage state; but the civilization of primitive man is written on the monuments of the most ancient nations. That all barbarous races show the clearest proofs of a civilized origin is now generally admitted by ethnologists, and amongst others, by Professor Max Müller, who says:—"What do we know "of savage tribes beyond the last chapter of "their history? Do we ever get an insight into "their antecedents? Can we understand what after "all is everywhere the most important and the most "instructive lesson to learn, how they have come to "be what they are? . . . Their language proves, "indeed, that these so-called heathens with their "complicated systems of mythology, their artificial "customs, their unintelligible whims and savageries,

“are not the creatures of to-day or yesterday.
“Unless we admit a special creation for these
“savages, they must be as old as the Hindus, the
“Greeks and Romans, as old as we ourselves . . .
“They may have passed through ever so many
“vicissitudes, and what we consider as primitive
“may be, for all we know, a relapse into savagery,
“or a corruption of something that was more rational
“and intelligible in former stages.” (*India*, by F.
Max Müller, 1883.)

To contravene the statement of man's age as inferred from Genesis, others appeal to a system of their own on the origin of language. They argue that language was not a divine gift, but developed by man himself from rude beginnings into a state of perfection. This process, they say, was gradual, and necessarily so slow as to extend far beyond the time assigned by Moses to the age of man. Indeed, Bunsen lays it down that “twenty-one thousand
“years is a very probable term for the development
“of human language in the shortest line” (“*Egypt's Place in Universal History*,” Vol. iv., p. 563). But this is merely bold assertion, and upon such grounds no one can reasonably reject the Bible history of the origin of language. Upon this narrative the Church has pronounced no authoritative decision; but Catholics hold it to be singularly in keeping with the conclusion arrived at by the latest and most earnest students of comparative philology. These

high authorities declare the outcome of their laborious researches to be that every language now spoken in the world is lineally descended, in different degrees of relationship, from one of *three* parent-stocks. Hence all the existing varieties of human speech, according to their likeness either in words, or grammatical forms, or both, are grouped into the *Shemitic*, *Aryan*, and *Turanian* families, which, though perfectly distinct and independent in themselves, yet bear trace of one primeval tongue. Now, this is exactly the account given by Moses of the origin of language (Genesis ii. 19, 20, and xi. 1-8). According to this the language revealed to Adam and Eve was the only one upon the earth, until the children of Noe, incurred the divine displeasure by building the tower of Babel. God punished them by confounding their speech, so that they could not understand one another, a result which corresponds exactly with scientific investigation to the effect that the first language of the human race was broken up into three parent-stocks from which all the languages, now spoken in the world, have been produced.

Again it has been urged on chronological grounds that many of the most ancient nations require for the antiquity of their people a much longer period than the 8,000 years intimated by Moses. Thus, the Egyptians, on the authority of Manetho, their great historian, claim 53,000 years, or at least 11,500 according to Herodotus. Then the Babylo-

nians say their first king ascended the throne about 468,330 years before Christ; the Indians demand a similar space of time, and the Chinese allege the possession of documents, proving their nation to be flourishing thirty or forty thousand years previous to the establishment of the Celestial Empire under Fo-hi. But the important discoveries of M. Champollion and Dr. Young have finally disposed of the Egyptian pretensions, while other recent investigations prove the assertions of the Babylonians, Indians, and Chinese, to be without solid foundation.

III. THE MOSAIC ORIGIN OF PLANTS AND ANIMALS:—In the 12th, 21st, and 24th verses of the first chapter of Genesis it is stated that:—"The
"earth brought forth the green herb, and such as
"yieldeth seed according to its kind, and the tree that
"beareth fruit, having seed each one according to its
"kind. And God created the great whales, and every
"living and moving creature which the waters
"brought forth according to their *kinds*, and every
"winged fowl according to its kind. And God
"said let the earth bring forth the living creature in
"its *kind*, cattle and creeping things, and beasts of
"the earth after its *kind*. And God saw that it
"was good." Here Moses appears to teach that each species of plants and animals had an independent origin; but it is to be observed that the Church has not declared this to be the true

meaning of the inspired text. At the same time Catholics do believe that each species of plants and animals was separately created, and that this is the true sense of what Moses has sketched in the passage just quoted.

The late Mr. Charles Darwin in his "Origin of Species" (1859-60), undertakes to prove by an array of evidence, from his own observation of the organic world, that each species of plant, as well as each species of animal, was evolved from one common ancestor, that is some pre-existing organism. This process of species-making began, according to Darwin, back in the mists of antiquity. Whether the first organism was only *one*, or many, and whence *this* or *these* derived *its* or *their* own existence, he does not say. This original existence he takes for granted, and proceeds to build upon it as follows:—"Can it be thought
"improbable, seeing that variations, useful to man,
"have undoubtedly occurred, that other variations,
"useful in the same way to each being in the great
"and complex battle of life, should sometimes occur
"in the course of thousands of generations? If
"such do occur can we doubt—remembering that
"many more individuals are born than can possibly
"survive—that individuals having any advantage,
"however slight, over others, would have the best
"chance of surviving and of pro-creating their kind?
"On the other hand, we may feel sure that any

“variation, in the least degree injurious, would be
“rigidly destroyed. This preservation of favourable
“variations and the rejection of unfavourable varia-
“tions I call *Natural Selection*. Variations neither
“useful nor injurious would not be affected by
“natural selection, and would be left a fluctu-
“ating element as, perhaps, we see in the species
“called polymorphic.” He goes on to show that
the principle of natural selection works best
under certain influences:—“In such cases,” he says,
“every slight modification, which in the course of
“ages chanced to arise, and which in any way
“favoured the individuals of any of the species by
“better adapting to their altered conditions would
“tend to be preserved, and natural selection would
“thus have free scope for the work of improvement.”
And as a result of this natural selection, he adds:—
“Now I cannot see any insuperable difficulty in
“further believing that the membrane-connected
“fingers and forearm of the *Galeopithecus* might be
“greatly lengthened by natural selection, and this,
“as far as the organs of flight are concerned, would
“convert it into a bat.” Darwin, therefore, observes
the rate of production in plants and animals to be
such that if the whole were allowed to survive
the world would not contain them. Thus the weak
must make room for the strong; and to determine
this issue all are plunged into a “struggle for
existence,” either in contending with their own

species for the same food-supply where there is question of animals, and for their share of the soil, the rainfall, and the sunshine where there is question of plants. This combat has never ceased, and will never cease, so that in each succeeding generation a great many must remain vanquished. These are left "unimproved or but little improved," and they soon disappear, leaving the stronger to procreate their kind. Thus "the fittest survive," and a change for the better is imparted at every stage, until the external form and internal structure of the original stock is so improved after the lapse of ages as to be quite different from what it was in the beginning—a new species in fact. Such then is the theory of "Natural Selection" as applied by Darwin to the origin of plants and animals; but he has not succeeded in producing even one instance of such "variation" which could be regarded as a truly distinct species. Plants and animals may be developed into varieties within the same species, but, as far as experience shows, never have been improved out of their own into a new species.

IV. THE MOSAIC ORIGIN OF MAN:—The creation of man is given in the book of Genesis as follows:—"And the Lord God formed man of the slime of the earth, and breathed into his face the breath of life, and man became a living soul" (ii. 7). As regards man's body, the plain meaning of this statement of Moses is that God created it immediately

from "the slime of the earth," and the majority of those, who hold the very highest place among the expounders of the Christian faith, believe such to be the true sense of the inspired passage. No doubt the Sacred writer does not expressly say that God converted "the slime of the earth" immediately into flesh, and hence there are persons, who contend that God did not form the body of Adam immediately from "the slime of the earth," but from some animal substance already existing. This opinion, no matter how it may differ from that of the bulk of the best theologians, is not certainly a heresy, since the Church has never formally declared what is the true meaning of these words.

In reference to the statement in Genesis about the origin of the part of man that is immortal, it is certain that the rational soul, breathed into the body of Adam, and into that of every child of Adam, that is into the body of every member of the human race from the beginning, was the result of a special creation immediately by God. This truth, though not expressly defined by the Church, is so manifestly contained in some of her dogmatic decrees, that among Catholics the doctrine cannot be one of speculation. Hence, so far as the creation of the soul is concerned, Catholics feel themselves bound to hold that it has come immediately from the hands of God.

On this question of the origin of man Darwin

has expressed certain views in his "Descent of Man" (1871):—

"Von Baer," he says, "has defined advancement or progress in the original scale better than any one else, as resting on the amount of differentiation and specialization of the several parts of a being, when arrived at maturity, as I should be inclined to add. Now, as organisms have become slowly adapted to diversified lines of life by means of natural selection, their parts will become more and more differentiated and specialised for various functions, from the advantage gained by the division of physiological labour. The same part appears often to have been modified first for one purpose, and then, long afterwards, for some other and quite distinct purpose; and thus all the parts are rendered more and more complex. But each organism still retains the general type of structure of the progenitor from which it was aboriginally derived. In accordance with this view it seems, if we turn to geological evidence, that organization on the whole has advanced throughout the world by slow and interrupted steps. In the great kingdom of the Vertebrata it has culminated in man. It must not, however, be supposed that groups of organic beings are always supplanted, and disappear as soon as they have given birth to other and more perfect groups. The latter, though victorious over their predecessors, may not have become better adapted for all places in the economy of nature. Some old forms appear to have survived from inhabiting protected sites, where they have not been exposed to very severe competition, and these often aid us in constructing our genealogies by giving us a fair idea of former and lost populations. But we must not fall into the error of looking at the existing members of any lowly organised group as perfect representatives of their ancient predecessors."

"The most ancient progenitors in the kingdom of the Vertebrata, at which we are able to obtain an obscure glance, apparently consisted of a group of marine animals representing the larvæ of existing Ascidians. These animals probably gave rise to a group of fishes

“as lowly organised as the lancelet; and from these the Ganvods, and other fishes like the *Lepidosiren* must have been developed. From such fish a very small advance would carry us on to the Amphibians. We have seen that birds and reptiles were once intimately connected together; and the *Monotremata* now connect mammals with reptiles in a slight degree. But no one can at present say by what line of descent the three higher and related classes, namely, mammals, birds, and reptiles, were derived from the two lower Vertebrate classes, namely, amphibians and fishes. In the class of mammals the steps are not difficult to conceive which led from the ancient *Monotremata* to the ancient *Marsupials*; and from these to the early progenitors of the placental mammals. We may thus ascend to the *Lemuridæ*; and the interval is not very wide from these to the *Semiadæ*. The *Semiadæ* then branched off into two great stems, the new world and the old world monkeys; and from the latter, at a remote period, man, the wonder and glory of the universe, proceeded.”

And again :—

“Whether primeval man, when he possessed but few arts, and those of the rudest kind, and when the power of language was extremely imperfect, would have deserved to be called man, must depend on the definition we employ. In a series of forms graduating insensibly from some ape-like creature to man as he now exists, it would be impossible to fix any definite point when the term ‘man’ ought to be used.”

Darwin, therefore, maintains that the internal, as well as the external human form, rounded to its present perfection, is the result of an *evolution*, that began perhaps, millions of years ago, in some “ape-like creature.” From this highest type of ape, man, according to Darwin, has been produced by slow degrees on the principle of “natural selection” through “variation,” just as it is said the Chim-

panzee and Gorilla have been developed from the lowest type of ape.

The advocates of this Darwinian system on the origin of man try to support it by the oldest human skulls, dug out of the cave-deposits, which skulls, they say, bear a striking resemblance to those of apes. But the oldest human skulls and bones as yet brought to the surface by Geologists differ from those of the ape as much as the skull and bones of man now living, and the chasm between these is wide indeed. It is quite certain that in the physical constitution of primitive man, nothing has been found, so far, to prove either the transition from the ape to the man, or the man to the ape. Professor Huxley declares this, and in these countries he is the highest living authority on such matters. "Every bone," he says, "of a gorilla bears marks by which it might be distinguished from the corresponding bone of a man; and in the present creation, at any rate, no intermediate link bridges over the gap between Homo and Troglodytes."

ORIGINAL UNITY OF THE HUMAN RACE :—That every man who came into the world since Adam has descended from him is explicitly declared by Moses when he says that his wife, Eve, "was the mother of all the living" (iii. 20). St. Paul puts the same, not more clearly but more forcibly when in the Areopagus of Athens he proclaimed :—"And (God) hath made of one all mankind to dwell upon

“the face of the earth” (Acts xvii. 26). In 1655 Isaac De la Peyrere, a prominent Calvinist, who afterwards renounced his errors and embraced the Catholic faith, wrote a commentary on the twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth verses, fifth chapter of St. Paul’s Epistle to the Romans. In this and in a special treatise, which soon followed, he taught that before Adam other races of men existed upon the earth; that the Jews only were descended from Adam, and the Bible is exclusively taken up with them. The Church condemned this doctrine, and it is since known as the *Pre-Adamite* heresy.

To this Catholic doctrine some object on the authority of comparative anatomy, physiology, and philology. They say that there is a radical or specific difference in the relative size and form of the human crania, as well as between the white and coloured races. But universally acknowledged authority, in this department of Scientific research, has pronounced the differences between the white man, the red Indian and the Negro, not only in respect to the peculiar make and proportions of the skull, but the colour of the skin, the quality of the hair, etc., to be derived from the slow influence of food, climate and other circumstances. That there are among the descendants of Adam and Eve many with yellow and black skins, as well as a peculiar formation of head, is not to be wondered at when the absence of long years under the influ-

ence of Indian heat, unwholesome diet, can effect so great a change as to make it difficult to recognise a once-familiar presence; and if this be continued from generation to generation for some hundreds of years, the original complexion will be quite different from what it was. In the Yankees of to-day, for instance, it would be difficult to trace anything of the well-shaped head, round features, and soft fair skin of their pilgrim fathers.

It is urged that, according to savans of high standing, the four thousand languages which, it is said, are now upon the earth, have nothing absolutely in common except the end at which they aim. From this it is concluded that since the languages of men did not come from one primitive tongue, men themselves have not descended from one pair. But there has been so much said already to confirm the Biblical truth of the common origin of all existing languages, that nothing remains to be added here. It is a powerful argument, no doubt, for the original unity of the human race, and not in the least shaken by the unsupported opinion of a few.

The recent investigations into the language, tradition, and religion of America, North and South, prove that they are of Eastern origin, and that these lands were peopled from Asia. How any of the dispersed human race got to those countries, separated by vast oceans, is not mentioned in history; but there is no reason why their acquaint-

ance with ship-building and navigation should not be equal to the task, seeing that Noe's knowledge in the same department was able to cope with the difficulties of the *Deluge*.

THE DELUGE :—The history of this awful cataclysm with which the earth was visited about the year of the world, 1656, is given in the 6th, 7th, and 8th Chapters of Genesis. The one great fact in this Sacred history, namely, that God sent the Flood, upon the earth is covered by inspiration, so that it cannot be false. And yet there are persons who venture to deny this inspired fact. Dr. Colenso, in his preface to “The Pentateuch, and Book of Joshua critically Examined,” speaking of the Deluge, makes a sad declaration of his unbelief :—“ I felt,” he says, “ that I dared not, as a servant of the God of truth, urge my brother-man to believe that which I did not myself believe, which I knew to be untrue.” In respect, however, to the absolute universality of the Flood, it is right to point out that this is neither so perspicuously set forth in the Mosaic account, as to render it undeniable, nor has the Catholic Church infallibly attached to it this meaning. About the year 1675, a remarkable treatise appeared on the Flood of Noe. This work was attributed to Isaac Voss, who gave up his position of leader of the Dutch Calvinists for a rich canonry in the Anglican Church. He held that the Deluge was partial, as well as local, and in

1686, at Rome, his book was put upon the Index, but not condemned as heretical. Therefore, the fact of this particular kind of universality of the Flood, namely, that it covered every spot upon the earth's surface, and drowned every human being, every beast, bird and creeping thing, is neither necessarily inspired, nor has the Catholic Church, so far, defined it solemnly. At the same time it is Catholic teaching, for it is implied in the statement of the inspired writer, and that every human being then alive, was swallowed up in the Flood, St. Peter teaches when he says:—"In the days of Noe, when the Ark was a building, wherein a few, that is eight souls, were saved by water. Whereunto baptism being of the like form, now saveth you also" (1st Epistle of St. Peter, iii. 20, 22).

Most Sceptics take exception, not to the fact of the Deluge; but to its *universality*. It was, they say, of a limited character, because, 1°, neither was there water enough in existence to submerge all the low lands on the globe, and to rise fifteen cubits above the peaks of the highest mountains; nor was there room enough for all the beasts, birds, and other creatures, represented to have been stowed away in the ark. But, in this stupendous display of God's power, must His avenging arm be shortened to meet what is regarded, by some only, as too small a space and too limited a supply of water? 2°. It is asserted to be on record that immense populations, flourished

in Egypt, China, India, etc., about two hundred years after the date of this alleged overwhelming act of God's anger. To account for this appears impossible to Sceptical minds, if every man, woman and child, in the world at the time, were swept away by the Flood. But did not God give a special blessing of fecundity to Noe and his family? On their leaving the Ark he told them to:—"Increase and multiply, and fill the earth; let the fear and dread of you be upon all the beasts of the earth, and upon all the fowls of the air, and all that move upon the earth" (Genesis ix. 1, 2). Therefore by the peculiar arrangement of Divine Providence, Noe and his children were to multiply with a rapidity truly miraculous, and the animal kingdom was to extend accordingly. Is it not also a well-ascertained fact that unmistakable traces of a Deluge, such as Moses describes, are engraved in indelible lines on the face of the earth? The late Cardinal Wiseman, in his sixth lecture on "Science and Revealed Religion," has proved this by an abundance of the most reliable Geological testimony.



PART II.



SPECIAL INTRODUCTION.



THE OLD TESTAMENT BOOKS.

CHAPTER I.

THE PENTATEUCH.

Genesis—Exodus—Leviticus—Numbers—Deuteronomy.

GENESIS:—The opening Book of the Pentateuch derives its Greek name from the subject of which it treats. This is the creation (*γενεσις*) of the world, and with it the history of man till the death of Joseph in Egypt. Into this narrative, extending over a period of 2,369 years, is woven an account of all that God did to keep alive in the hearts of men the revelation He communicated to Adam and the Patriarchs.

EXODUS is a most suggestive title for the Second Book of the Pentateuch, since it is chiefly devoted to the departure of the Israelites from Egypt, about 143 years after the death of Joseph in that country. Its opening chapter is occupied with a detailed description of the heavy burden laid by their Egyptian taskmasters upon

the Hebrews, in order to break down their spirit and diminish their number. Then follows an account of the birth of Moses, his education, and the events of his early life, marked by his fearless sympathy with his oppressed countrymen, whom, in the wonderful Providence of God, he was raised up to deliver. This relief came when they had been in Egypt 215 years, for St. Paul says (Gal. iii. 17), that the solemn promulgation of the law happened 430 years after the covenant with Abraham, which took place about 215 years before Jacob and his sons went down into Egypt, so that the Israelites could have been in Egypt only 215 years. At the end of this period Moses and Aaron appeared for the last time before the Egyptian monarch with the Divine command to let "the children of Israel go out of his land." But Pharaoh again stubbornly refused, for "his heart was hardened," and God sent the tenth plague with all its terrible consequences. This awful calamity came at midnight, when the destroying angel went forth and "slew every first-born in the land of Egypt, from the first-born of Pharaoh, who sat on his throne, unto the first-born of the captive woman that was in prison, and all the first-born of cattle" (Exodus xii. 29). The groans of the dying in dead of night filled the living with horror and confusion:—"And Pharaoh
"arose in the night, and all his servants, and all
"Egypt; and there arose a great cry in Egypt, for

“there was not a house wherein there lay not
“one dead. And Pharaoh calling Moses and Aaron
“in the night said: Arise, and go forth from
“among my people, you and the children of Israel”
(Exodus xii. 30, 31). Accordingly the children of
Israel went out from bondage, 600,000 “men on
foot” with Moses at their head. If the number of
“men on foot,” that is men fit to bear arms, be
multiplied by four (for their proportion is about
one-fourth of the population), the total of eman-
cipated Israelites must have been about two millions
and a-half. This is an enormous increase upon the
three score and ten souls who went down into Egypt
only 215 years before. To prevent His people from
straying in the wilderness God placed before them
a miraculous column of cloud, which at night became
a pillar of fire to light up their encampment. After
a few days’ journey they found themselves in a
narrow defile, opening out upon the shore of the
Red Sea. Here they were overtaken by the
Egyptians, who had repented having allowed them
to depart, and coming up in pursuit, closed the
ravine from behind, thus rendering all escape,
humanly speaking, impossible. The Israelites
trembled at the sight of their old oppressors, but
Moses calmed their fears by telling them to trust
in God, who would surely protect them. Accord-
ingly that very night, the Lord directed them to
march forward to the sea, when Moses waved his

rod over the deep, and instantly the waters divided, leaving a dry road all the way across to the opposite shore. Then the pillar of fire shifted from front to rear, and guided the fugitives over, while it effectually concealed their movements from the enemy. But as soon as the Israelites were found to have advanced the Egyptians followed, quite unprepared for the terrible reality of being actually on the bed of the sea. The break of day, however, revealed their situation. They saw the Israelites all safely landed on the opposite shore, and themselves passing between two swelling bodies of water, which threatened to fall and swallow them. In their terror they cried out, "Let us flee from the face of Israel, for Jehovah fighteth for them against the Egyptians." Just then Moses "stretched forth his hand over the sea," and the heaped-up flood rolled down, burying in its depths the whole Egyptian army. From this point the Israelites journeyed through the wilderness for about a month, when their provisions ran out. But God rained down manna from heaven, which, when ground like corn, and made into cakes, became to them "a staff of life" during their protracted wandering. Thus they were enabled to reach the foot of Mount Sinai, and here commenced the forming of this chosen people into a holy nation, for which all the great events just recorded were a preparation. On the morning of the 50th day after the Israelites left Egypt,

when they were, by God's orders, drawn up outside their camp, the mountain began to quake with thunder, lightning flashing around, and high above all could be heard the blast of a trumpet, so loud as to make the hearers tremble with fear. From out the thick darkness, in which the summit of Mount Sinai was enveloped, a voice announced the *Ten Commandments*. God also, for the guidance of His people, dictated to Moses a regulated series of laws, designed to secure the purpose for which they were set apart, viz., the preservation and transmission of the true religion. That there is but one God was made the fundamental law of this code, and as He was also their temporal king, idolatry became high treason. In this way the religion of the Jews was so welded into their civil constitution, that any violation of the one was an infringement on the precepts of the other. This was the period of *theocracy*, when God Himself immediately enacted the civil and religious laws, and by them governed His people. Here too God enjoined an elaborate ceremonial with symbolical appendages. The tribe of Levi was set apart for the sacred ministry, and a portable temple or tabernacle was constructed according to a plan given to Moses on the mountain. All these important events make up the subject of the Book of *Exodus*.

LEVITICUS:—This name of the Third Book of the Pentateuch, had its origin in the ordinances

relating to the Levites, to which it is chiefly devoted. The sacrifices to be offered were either bloody, and a figure of the Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross, or unbloody, and were a type of the Sacrifice of the Mass. The religious feasts of the Jews were the Pasch, in memory of their deliverance from Egypt, and the Pentecost, seven weeks after the Pasch, to celebrate the promulgation of the law on Mount Sinai. There was also the annual feast of Tabernacles, to commemorate their long wandering in the desert, and the feast of Expiation, when the Priests offered sacrifice for their own sins, and the sins of the people. At the head of the ministry, charged with this public worship came the High Priest, Aaron being the first to fill this office. His sons were the first priests, and the Levites took care of the tabernacle as well as the sacred vessels, etc.

NUMBERS:—Before leaving Mount Sinai, Moses had a census taken of the adult male population under his command, and the total was 625,850, exclusive of the tribe of Levi. It was now the beginning of the second year after the Exodus, and the people of God were approaching the promised land, when the report of ten of the twelve commissioners, sent to reconnoitre the condition of affairs, created a panic. Caleb and Josue, two members of the party, represented the situation on the contrary as encouraging. Their

assurances, however, did not satisfy this ungrateful race, who distrusted the Lord, and rebelled against Him. God declared He would destroy them off the face of the earth ; but at the prayer of Moses, He commuted the dread sentence into one of forty years sojourn in the wilderness. Josue and Caleb were the only two who survived to enter the promised land. At the expiration of this term Moses ordered a second census of the men of twenty years and upwards. They numbered 625,030, so that the census of the forty years before, showed an excess over the present of only 820. By adding the number of adult females, which is about the same as that of males, and doubling the result to include in a population the proportion of those under twenty years, Abraham's descendants were found to have already reached 2,400,000.. The history of these two census gives the name of Numbers to this book, which also contains the history of some other remarkable events that occurred during its interval of 39 years.

DEUTERONOMY :—This Greek term; which means literally the second law, was given to the fifth Book of the Pentateuch, because it is to some extent a repetition of what is contained in Leviticus, Numbers and Exodus. In it Moses, finding his end near, delivered a farewell address, in which he goes over again all the most prominent enactments in the Divine legislation, and concludes with a strong

exhortation to fulfil these laws to the letter, since upon this faithful observance would depend God's special care for them. Moses then [having installed Josue as his successor, prophesied the future disobedience of his fickle countrymen, their repentance and pardon, then, ascending Mount Nebo, to take a view of the "Land of Promise," he died at the age of 120, "and," says the Scripture, "the Lord "buried him in the valley of the land of Moab, "over against Phogor, and no man hath known of "his sepulchre until this present day." (Deuteronomy xxxiv. 6).





CHAPTER II.

HISTORICAL BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

Josue—Judges—Ruth—The four Books of Kings—First and Second Paralipomenon—First and Second Books of Esdras—Tobias—Judith—Esther—Job—First and Second Books of Machabees.

THE HISTORICAL BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT cover a space of 1,017 years, and are 17 in number, viz. :—Josue, Judges, Ruth, four Books of Kings, two of Paralipomenon, two of Esdras, Tobias, Judith, Esther, Job, and two of Machabees. They give the history of the Israelites from the death of Moses to the time when Esdras brought back the Jews from the captivity of Babylon to revive the worship of God in the new Temple at Jerusalem. The writer of two only (the first and second of Esdras) is known by tradition, but the authorship of the remaining fifteen is uncertain.

JOSUE :—This book, except the last five verses, which may have been supplied by Samuel, was probably written by Josue himself after leading the Israelites into Chanaan, where he died about 1448 B.C. It relates the history of the 25 years between 1451 and 1426 B.C., during which Chanaan was conquered and occupied by the Israelites under

Josue. In the third and fourth chapters is described the miracle of a dry passage having been opened in the Jordan for the Israelites, and in the sixth chapter is told how the strongly fortified city of Jericho, the first to offer resistance, was conquered by a stupendous display of the Divine power. In the tenth chapter a similar manifestation is related, when in answer to the prayer of Josue, the daylight was protracted for twelve or fourteen hours to give time to complete the victory over the combined forces of the five Kings who ventured to oppose the progress of the Israelitic host. "Move not, O sun, toward Gabaon, nor thou, O moon, toward the valley of Ajalon. And the sun and the moon stood still, till the people revenged themselves of their enemies" (Josue-x. 12-13).

JUDGES:—The history of the people of Israel for long after the death of Josue is but a record of their scandalous relapses into the abominations of idol-worship. For these sins of high treason against their heavenly King they fell under the lash of the neighbouring tyrants. Broken by extreme suffering they, from the depths of bleeding hearts sought mercy, and, on each occasion, God raised up a *Judge*, i.e., a leader, who rescued them, by supernatural aid, from the calamitous consequences of their intimate and forbidden relations with the idolatrous nations around.

These *Judges* were thirteen in number, and the

wonders they performed, though not following in regular succession, are described, and occupy a period of not less than 350 years. Some think that this, like most Old Testament books, was compiled from a register of events deposited in the Tabernacle and kept by the Scribes, who became an institution among the Jews after the establishment of the theocracy. These official records were put into book-form in the present instance, they say, most probably by Samuel, because the writer often refers to the time when:—"There was no king in Israel;" and, therefore, he must have lived, as Samuel did, under the Jewish monarchy.

The book was written, doubtless, to show that the Israelites prospered so long as they were faithful to the Divine commands. When, however, they began to intermarry with the Chanaanites and to join in their idolatrous practices, God allowed them to be vanquished and oppressed. Accordingly, when the iron heel of the Philistines pressed most heavily on the Israelites, Samson was promised by Heaven to the prayers of his parents as a "Nazarite of God from his mother's womb," that is, one consecrated, like Samuel and St. John the Baptist, by a perpetual vow neither to drink wine, cut the hair, nor touch the dead. Samson in due time was appointed *Judge* to break the Philistine yoke. For this task God gave him incredible muscular strength, with an express intimation that his

prowess entirely depended on the faithful performance of his vow. In the display of his supernatural might he tore a lion limb from limb, slew 1,000 men of the brave Philistines with the jaw-bone of an ass, and carried off the ponderous gates of Gaza, a strong town of that nation. At last the secret of his strength was wrested from him by Dalila, "a woman who dwelt in the valley of Sorec." She treacherously revealed it to the Philistines, and having shaved his head while asleep, handed him over in a helpless condition to them. They put out his eyes and flung him into a prison where he repented, and when his hair grew again he received back his strength.

It was arranged to exhibit him in a great show to be given to the Philistine nobility in the temple of Dagon, in honour of this favourite idol. On Samson being led in he asked to be allowed to rest himself for a moment, when the spirit of God coming upon him he wrenched the two great supports of the temple from their sockets and buried himself with 3,000 others in the ruins. St. Paul proposes Samson as a model of those who died in defence of the faith, and, indeed, all his feats of prodigious strength were done by the Divine will to enable him to fulfil his mission of setting the people of God free.

BOOK OF RUTH:—This is an appendix to the Book of Judges, and, at the same time, an introduc-

tion to the Books of Kings. It gives the beautiful story of Ruth, a Moabitess, who fervently embraced the religion of an Israelite, whom she married in the land of Moab. The pious Ruth, after the death of her husband, went to Bethlehem, where she supported her destitute mother-in-law by "gleaning the ears of corn" that escaped the hands of the reapers in the fields of Booz, a rich man of the tribe of Juda. Her virtues soon attracted the notice of Booz, who made her his wife. They had a son, Obed, who was the grandfather of David. Samuel is supposed to have written this episode in order to show the descent of David from the line of Juda, and thus trace the genealogy of the Messiah, who was to come from that royal tribe, according to the prophecy of Jacob.

THE FOUR BOOKS OF KINGS:—About 1091 B.C., Samuel, the last of the Judges, being now too old for the weighty cares of office, transferred them to his sons; but they "turned aside after lucre, and took bribes and perverted judgment" (1 Kings viii. 3). Their infamous conduct, and the menacing attitude of the Ammonites, made the anxious Israelites importune Samuel to give them a monarch. The holy man, to dissuade them, pointed to the tyranny of the surrounding autocrats, and asked why did they seek a change which, for all they knew, might degenerate, like those neighbouring systems, into the worst despotism? But they were

deaf to his appeal and insisted on the appointment of a king over them. Saul was accordingly selected, and appointed by Samuel as King. Jews and Protestants call the first two Books of Kings "1st and 2nd of Samuel," and no doubt Samuel is the author of twenty-four chapters of the first book; but as his death is announced in the twenty-fifth chapter, he cannot be regarded as the writer of the second book. The material for the remainder of the first book, as well as the whole of the second, third and fourth books, was no doubt, taken from the official records already described, and arranged, probably, either by Jeremias, Ezechiel or Esdras. In the first book there is a sketch of the life of Heli, the High Priest, followed by an account of the virtues of Samuel, of the appointment of Saul, as well as the career of David and Jonathan. The second book is a history of King David's reign, and in the third it is told how this monarch, about 1015 B.C., on the eve of his death, summoned an assembly of the nation, and announced to them that the succession to his throne belonged to the tribe of Juda, and named his son, Solomon, as his heir. Then, after exhorting Solomon to build the Temple for which the materials were already prepared, he breathed his last. Fidelity to God was the special feature in the character of this great monarch, and it is to be remembered that his sins of adultery and murder were entirely effaced by an humble confession and sincere repentance.

The reign of David's son Solomon, is the most splendid period of Hebrew history. His kingdom was considerable, extending from the Euphrates to the Mediterranean, and from Phœnicia to the Red Sea. His devotedness to the true faith was so acceptable that on one occasion God promised to grant whatever he would ask. The Holy Scripture tells us that his demand was for "an understanding heart "to judge Thy people, and discern between good and "evil, for who shall be able to judge this Thy people "which is so numerous" (3 Kings iii. 9). God was so pleased with this request that He endowed Solomon with a degree of wisdom such as no man possessed. In the height of great national peace and prosperity Solomon began the building of the Temple. In this work he was assisted by Hiram, King of Tyre, who ordered the cedars of Lebanon to be felled and sent to Jerusalem, whither he also despatched skilled workers in gold, silver, jewels, and the dyeing of precious stuffs. The plan of the tabernacle was followed exactly in the construction of the Temple, and over seven years were expended upon the work. It measured "three score cubits in length, and twenty cubits in breadth, and thirty cubits in height." Its proportions were gracefully broken on the outside by porticoes and courts, while the walls and roofs of the interior, which was divided into "the Holy of Holies," and an outer Sanctuary, were of cedar:—"having the

“turnings and the joints thereof artfully wrought, “and carvings projecting out. And there was “nothing in the Temple that was not covered with “gold” (3 Kings vi. 18 and 22). When this “House of the Lord” was completed, the glory of God filled it, and the ark with the stone-tables of the law were deposited within its sanctuary. It was about this time that the Queen of Saba, attracted by the fame of Solomon, came to Jerusalem to “try him with hard questions.” His answers made her exclaim, “Blessed are thy men, and “blessed are thy servants who stand before thee “always and hear thy wisdom” (3 Kings x. 8). But “the understanding heart” of this wise and gentle monarch was soon turned away by his idolatrous wives, whom he indulged in the practice of their rites of polytheism. They gradually gained him over to their false divinities, and in punishment for this God declared that He would “divide and rend” his kingdom. This sentence was conveyed by the prophet Ahias, the Silonite, to Jeroboam, a distinguished member of the tribe of Ephraim, with the assurance that he would be king of ten tribes, leaving two only to the royal line of David. This threatened disruption of the kingdom, however, did not take place until after the death of Solomon, as God had declared by the mouth of the prophet.

REVOLT OF THE TEN TRIBES :—Roboam succeeded Solomon, and to meet the debts contracted in his

father's reign he imposed a grinding tax upon the whole nation. The elders of the people petitioned for a remission, but their prayer was rejected by the young king, who threatened them with even greater severity, saying: "My father put a heavy yoke upon you, but I will add to your yoke; my father beat you with whips, but I will beat you with scorpions" (3 Kings xii. 11). The moment had now arrived for the fulfilment of the Divine sentence, and ten tribes revolted with Jeroboam for their king. They retired to Samaria and made that the centre of the new *Kingdom of Israel*. The two tribes that remained loyal to Roboam were Juda and Benjamin, and they constituted the *Kingdom of Juda*.

CAPTIVITIES:—About 971 B.C. began the rapid decline of the two kingdoms into which the chosen people were now divided. This was due to the conduct of depraved Sovereigns, who not only fell into idolatrous practices themselves, but encouraged idol-worship among their subjects. Prophets were sent by God at various periods to remind them of their duty, but their warnings were for the most part unheeded by the misguided and perverse people. In punishment of this grievous sin, calamity succeeded calamity until it ended in the overthrow of the Kingdom of Israel by Salmanasar, the Assyrian monarch, about 722 B.C., and of the Kingdom of Juda in 606 B.C. by Nabuchodonosor, King of Babylon. Sedecias, the last of the kings of Juda, disregarding

the advice of Jeremias the prophet, was taken before Nabuchodonosor, his eyes put out, his sons slain, and he himself sent in chains to Babylon. Jerusalem was burned down and its unhappy people carried into captivity. The exiles, who were principally of the royal tribe, after seventy years, were permitted to return and rebuild the Temple, and thus Jacob's memorable prophecy of the sceptre being retained in the tribe of Juda till the coming of the Messias was fulfilled to the letter.

PARALIPOMENON (1st and 2nd), is a Greek word for things omitted, and has been applied to these books because they contain many particulars which did not find room in the books of Kings. They are also called the books of Chronicles, and are supposed to have been compiled by Esdras from the public records.

FIRST AND SECOND BOOKS OF ESDRAS:—In the first of these books it is related that Esdras or Ezra, “the prince of the Synagogue,” revised the *Book of the Law* and took care that its provisions should be observed. Mention is also made of King Cyrus breaking up the Babylonish captivity, by permitting the expatriated Jews to return to Jerusalem and rebuild their Temple. This edict of Cyrus was not, however, acted upon until 458 B.C. in the reign of Assuerus, when Esdras led the emancipated Jews back to the land from which they had been exiled. Nehemias succeeded to Ezra, and how he expounded

as well as enforced the law is told in the Second Book of Esdras by Nehemias himself.

TOBIAS:—Amongst the captive Israelites whom Salmanasar, King of Ninive, carried off from Samaria to Ninive in 721 B.C. was a member of the tribe of Nepthali. This was Tobias, a good man who was remarkable for his conscientious observance of the laws of God. It is said of him that he never bent the knee to the golden calf, set up in Samaria, but reserved his adoration for “the Lord God of Israel” (Tobias i. 6). He taught his son, the young Tobias, “to fear God and abstain from all sin” (Tobias i. 10). While a captive in Ninive the elder Tobias was constantly going amongst his afflicted countrymen:—“Feeding the hungry, “giving clothes to the naked, burying the dead, “and those that were slain” (Tobias i. 20). On one occasion, when he entertained some friends, it was announced that an Israelite had been murdered in the street. Tobias leaped from the table and carried the body to his own house, in order to bury it privately after sunset. This was against the law; still “he feared God more than the king” (Tobias ii. 9). It is related that subsequently he lost his sight, but in this severe trial he gave splendid proof of resignation and patience. At last, when his span of life was about to close, he called the young Tobias and directed him to set out for the distant city of Rages and ask one Gabelus there for the ten talents

he owed him. The son, not knowing the way, sought, with the father's approval, some faithful guide. The Archangel Gabriel, under the appearance of a young man, presented himself and was accepted. He not only conducted his charge successfully to and from Rages, but procured him a devoted wife and supplied the means of curing his father. Both the elder and younger Tobias in their gratitude offered a substantial remuneration, but this was declined and the Archangel disappeared.

This book, which abounds in moral instructions, would appear to be the work of both father and son, because the Archangel told them, "It is time therefore that I return to Him that sent me; but bless ye God, and publish all His wonderful works" (Tobias xii. 20). In this (twelfth) chapter there is also an account of the death of the elder Tobias, evidently written by the son, while from the 16th verse of the same chapter to the end, the death of young Tobias is described. It is not known by whom this portion has been written.

JUDITH:—In the reign of King Manasses, 666 B.C., Nabuchodonosor, King of Nineve, not the same as the Nabuchodonosor who afterwards reigned in Babylon, sent his general, Holofernes, with an army to subjugate the land of Israel. The invader had a triumphant march until he reached Bethulia, not far from Jerusalem, where the citizens offered a determined resistance. By cutting off the water

and other supplies Holofernes reduced the besieged to such straits that the governor, Ozias, promised to surrender in a few days unless, in the meantime, heaven came to their relief. Judith, a pious young widow of great wealth and beauty, who wore hair-cloth, and fasted every day, reproached Ozias for thus putting a term to the Divine mercy, and exhorted her fellow citizens to join in earnest prayer to the offended majesty of God. Then substituting for her widow's dress rich robes, and adorned with jewels of rare value, she proceeded to the Assyrian camp and asked to see their leader. Holofernes, captivated by the singular beauty of his visitor, gave her a friendly welcome. One evening, Judith, being invited by the general to his tent with improper design, found him in a drunken fit, and snatching a sword that hung upon the wall, she struck off the head of the sensual Holofernes. Still holding the ghastly object in her hands, Judith hurried with it into the beleagured city and roused the fainting courage of the citizens by recounting what she had done. Filled with a spirit of ardour, they attacked the Assyrians, who were thrown into confusion by the death of their leader, and suffered a total defeat. At the news, Joachim, the High Priest, came down from Jerusalem, and on seeing Judith, cried out:—"Thou art the glory of Jerusalem, thou art the joy of Israel, thou art the honour of our people" (Judith xv. 10). In

response Judith burst forth into a canticle of tender thanksgiving, which closes this book, supposed to have been written by Joachim, the High Priest.

ESTHER:—Assuerus, the third King of Babylon in succession from Cyrus, about 417 B.C., divorced his queen, Vasthi, and married Esther, a Jewess. Esther being an orphan, had been brought up in the practice of solid virtue by her uncle, Mardochai, who, now that his niece was queen, often visited the palace. Upon one occasion he overheard the eunuchs planning to take away the king's life. Esther was told at once of the wicked design, and lost no time in informing her royal husband of the conspiracy, who had the eunuchs put to death, and Mardochai raised to a high position at court. This so roused the jealousy of Aman, the prime minister, that he procured a royal edict to expel all the Jews in the kingdom. Mardochai brought this document to Esther, and she induced his majesty to cancel it. In the meantime Aman made every arrangement to hang Mardochai, but the night before the execution, Assuerus, starting out of a horrible dream, commanded the public annals to be read aloud to him. When the passage relating the terrible plot of the eunuchs, and its discovery by Mardochai, had been gone over, the prime minister was summoned into the royal presence, and asked: "What ought to be done to the man whom 'the king desireth to honour?'" (Esther vi. 6). Aman,

believing the distinction to be intended for himself, made a proposal which Assuerus ordered to be conferred on Mardochai. Just then Esther told Assuerus of Aman's bitter hostility to her uncle, and the king condemned his minister to be hanged upon the same gallows-tree that had been prepared for Mardochai. The authorship of this book is generally attributed to Mardochai, because in the 9th chapter it is stated that "Mardochai wrote all these things."

JOB:—Job was an Arabian remarkable for a holy life. The fact of his riches, consisting in flocks and pasturage, and his acting as priest in his own family, places him certainly in the patriarchal times, though there are some who think he was a contemporary of Moses about 1520 B.C. God allowed Satan to afflict this devout man in order to test his virtue. This was begun by the destruction of every beast on Job's extensive plains, and the murder of the herdsmen, except two, who escaped to tell the sad tale to the unhappy owner. Soon after this calamity Job was informed that his seven sons and three daughters, while together in a brother's house, were crushed to death by the falling in of the roof. But, though these misfortunes came rapidly upon him, Job did not complain. He said: "The Lord gave and the "Lord hath taken away, . . . blessed be the name of the Lord" (Job i. 21). But the last suffering sent to him by God was excruciating, for his whole

body became a mass of festering sores, so loathsome that his wife bade him "bless God and die" (Job ii. 9). Still he meekly observed:—"If we have received good things at the hand of God why should we not receive evil" (Job ii. 10). In this state he was visited by some friends who sat at his feet for seven days without uttering a single word of sympathy. At last they broke this silence, with bitter remarks, to the effect that sinners only are afflicted by such painful diseases. Job replied that God, no doubt, being infinitely good, disposes all things justly and wisely; but He allows sometimes the wicked in this life to prosper, and the good to be sorely tried for an end known to Himself alone. Notwithstanding this glorious profession of faith Job ventured rashly to sound the Divine secrets in connection with his own case. God, from a whirlwind, reprehended this temerity. Job, seeing his error, humbled himself in dust and ashes, when God, after defending him from the cruel taunts of false friends, rewarded his patience and repentance by restoring him to his former prosperous condition and raising up a new family to him.

Job prophesied the coming of the Messias and the resurrection of the body in these words:—"For I know that my Redeemer liveth, and in the last day I shall rise out of the earth. And I shall be clothed again with my skin, and in my flesh I shall see my God. Whom I myself shall see, and my

“eyes shall behold, and not another; this my hope
“is laid up in my bosom” (Job xix. 25, 26).

The writer of this book is supposed to be Job himself, and his object was doubtless, to show that human ills are sent to the wicked in punishment of sin, and to the just as a proof of their virtue, but to determine when they are sent as a test, and when as a punishment, is known to God alone, and therefore rash for any man to inquire. Job is mentioned by Ezechiel (xiv. 14), and St. James in his Epistle (v. 14) speaks of him:—“You have heard,” he says, “of the patience of Job.”

MACHABEES I. and II. BOOKS:—These the last of the historical books of the Old Testament recount the persecution of the Jews by Antiochus Epiphanes, a descendant of one of the four generals to whom Alexander the great left his vast dominions. This Antiochus during his reign over Syria and Palestine, which began in 167 B.C., drove the Jews into rebellion by endeavouring to force them to worship idols which he caused to be sacrilegiously installed in the Temple at Jerusalem. Mathathias, the High Priest, who belonged to the family of the Asmoneans, took the field at the head of his outraged people. He was succeeded by his son Judas, surnamed Machabeus from the Hebrew words inscribed on his banner. When Judas fell, his brother Jonathan, took his place, and lastly his brother Simon; but they were all slain in battle. God visited Antiochus with

grievous suffering and a terrible death, while He gave extraordinary success to the army of the brave and pious Machabees. By their heroic deeds not only was the true religion preserved, but they brought peace to Judea, and consolidated this national blessing by passing wise laws and improving the internal administration of the government. The writer of this eventful part of the inspired volume, as far as regards the first Book of Machabees, is believed to be John Hyrcanus, son of Simon Machabeus, but who the writer of the second Book may be it is difficult even to conjecture.





CHAPTER III.

MORAL BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT AND THE PROPHETS.

The Psalms—Proverbs—Ecclesiastes—Canticle of Canticles—
Wisdom—Ecclesiasticus—Prophets.

THE PSALMS, which St. Athanasius pronounces to be an epitome of the whole Scripture, are a collection of hymns sung to the Lord by the Levites. They are unrivalled by anything either in sacred or profane writing, as regards force of argument, sublimity of poetry, boldness of figure, or strength of expression.

There are 150 Psalms in the Canon, of which those from the 119th to the 133rd are called *Gradual*, because they were chaunted by the Jews on their return from the Babylonish captivity. The titles which they have, as “unto the end,” St. Augustine believes to be canonical, but this is denied by others. The word psalm is derived from the Greek *ψαλλω*, to sing with harp-accompaniment, and hence the Latin *Psalterium*, the English *Psalter*. Some of the Psalms praise God’s perfections, others supplicate Him for favours, while not a few breathe deep re-

penitance for sin, and many of them prophesy the *Advent*, *Passion*, and *Resurrection* of our Blessed Lord. In reference to their authorship, the name of David is attached to 73, but more are attributed to him in the New Testament. Then 12 are ascribed to Asaph, 7 to the sons of Core, 2 to Solomon, one to Elihu the Ezrahite, and one to Moses ; but these also, according to Bellarmine, were composed by David and the names written upon them belong to the persons by whom they were sung. The Psalms in the original Hebrew are numbered differently from the Latin Vulgate, though the total (150) is the same in both. In the Hebrew the 9th Psalm is divided into two parts at verse 22, and the 113th Psalm at the 9th verse. The original has, therefore, two Psalms more than the Vulgate at this point; but in the 114th Psalm the Hebrew drops one by joining the 114th with the 115th, and a second at the 146th Psalm, where the difference disappears.

THE PROVERBS :—Are short pregnant sentences exhorting the reader to cultivate wisdom that is virtue, the truest wisdom, and avoid vice. Hence, St. Jerome says that Solomon wrote them for the instruction of the young, just as he wrote *Ecclesiastes* for persons of mature age to impress upon them the vanity of all human things, and the *Canticle of Canticles* for the old to set before them a perfect model of chastity.

ECCLESIASTES :—This is an exhortation by the same

author addressed to the whole Church (Εκκλησιά), designed to show that in this world there is nothing abiding, true or great, except to fear God and obey His commandments, so as to appear well before His judgment seat. Hence the oft-repeated exclamation, "Vanity of vanities and all is vanity . . . Fear God and keep His commandments, for this is all man."

CANTICLE OF CANTICLES is the greatest Canticle. In it under the symbol of a chaste spouse, represented as a shepherd, and his wife as the keeper of a vineyard, or the King's daughter, Solomon, who is believed to be the author, describes the love with which God cherishes the Synagogue, as well as the Christian Church of which the Synagogue was but the figure. The words of this *Canticle of Canticles* are applied to the union of Christ with all the just members of His Church, and especially with our Blessed Lady.

WISDOM:—Here, by striking examples taken from early Jewish history, kings and others in power are urged to study wisdom and the fear of God. It is styled "the Wisdom of Solomon," but St. Jerome and St. Augustine think it was the work of some other person now unknown.

ECCLESIASTICUS:—This book was written by "Jesus, the son of Sirach," who was a citizen of Jerusalem, remarkable for his piety in the time of Simon, the High Priest, in the third century before Christ. Wisdom is declared to consist in the fear of

God, and in order to assist in the cultivation of this heavenly virtue, rules adapted to all conditions of life are set forth in the fullest and most impressive manner.

PROPHETS:—The name *Prophet* is applied to one who predicts future events by his own or a supernatural light. The Scripture prophets received the Divine communication, either by a vision as in the case of Isaias, Daniel, Ezechiel and Zacharias, or in dreams as regards Jacob and Joseph, or by the apparition of Angels, as with Daniel, or even through the human voice as when God spoke to Moses from the burning bush, and to Samuel in the sleeping chamber, all of which had regard to future events. The special mission of the prophets in the old Law was to keep alive in the minds and hearts of the people of God the recollection of the true faith and its observances. They did so by working on the obstinate wills of the Jews with repeated assurances of the near coming of the Redeemer, while by the strongest motives of hope and fear, they endeavoured to deter this sensual people from idol-worship. As the two great prophets and miracle workers, Elias and Eliseus, did not commit their prophetic utterances to writing they are not mentioned amongst the seventeen prophets of the Old Testament. These seventeen are classified into four Major Prophets, viz.: Isaias, Jeremias, with Baruch, Ezechiel, and Daniel, so called because their writings are some-

what extended, and the twelve *Minor* Prophets whose writings are of a much more restricted character. The time covered by all these seventeen prophets was about 300 years, beginning with 750 B.C.





THE NEW TESTAMENT BOOKS.

CHAPTER I.

The Four Gospels—Acts of the Apostles—The Apocalypse.

THE first four Books of the New Testament contain the “Good tidings of great joy” announced to the world by Jesus Christ, and hence they are called in English *Gospels*, from the Saxon *good tidings*, which correspond to the Greek *Εὐαγγέλιον*, Latin *Evangelium*.

THE GOSPEL OF ST. MATTHEW:—The writer of this first gospel is Matthew or Levi, a native of Galilee, who held the post of collector of public taxes. St. Matthew was located at Capharnaum, an important station on the Lake of Gennesareth, when Jesus came there to preach. The simple fervour with which he followed the words of his Divine Teacher, won for him a call to the Apostolate, and the promptitude with which he obeyed this summons to a laborious and painful mission is attested by both St. Luke and St. Mark. Like the other Apostles he was engaged in evangelizing Judea until the time had arrived to “teach all nations” (Matthew xxviii. 19). This was either

in 51 A.D., immediately after the Council of Jerusalem, or in 42 A.D., when Herod Agrippa determined to exterminate the Christian name.

St. Matthew's zeal had so endeared him to the Jewish converts that on the eve of his departure they asked for some record of his holy teaching. Their request he gratified by writing his Gospel, and Eusebius, the historian (Hist. Eccl. iii. 42) in his notice of this fact, adds that "after having preached to the Jews St. Matthew left for other countries," Ethiopia, or perhaps Parthia, where according to tradition, he laid down his life for the faith.

This Gospel opens with the human generation of Jesus Christ, and hence St. Matthew is represented by a man, one of the four mystical animals, mentioned in Ezechiel (i. 1), and in the Apocalypse (iv. 7). The birth and infancy of our Divine Lord, as well as His forty day's fast, occupy four chapters, and sixteen are devoted to His public life, *passion*, *death*, and *resurrection*. He has grouped together the most prominent facts in these various stages in the life of the Redeemer, and shows that they accord exactly with the prophecies in the Old Testament regarding the promised Messias.

As the Gospel was intended chiefly for his countrymen, St. Matthew addressed them in their own language. This was the Syro-Chaldaic, that is the Hebrew modified by the Chaldaic or Syriac,



which the Jews were obliged to adopt during the seventy years' captivity in Babylon. Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis, in Phrygia, speaking of St. Matthew, soon after his martyrdom, says "Matthew wrote the Divine oracles in the Hebrew language." This statement is confirmed not only by Irenæus and Origen, but in a very beautiful story told by Eusebius (Ecel. Hist. iii. 29) of St. Pantenus, the founder of the famous School of Alexandria, in 179 A.D. It is to the effect that this eminent scholar, who gave up his high office for the burning sands of India to water the seed of the faith that St. Bartholomew had sown there, found during his missionary progress the original of St. Matthew's Gospel written in *Hebrew*. The Jewish converts, who were anxious for the retention of the Mosaic ritual, are said to have tampered with the text of this Gospel in order to have the authority of St. Matthew in support of their errors. The Hebrew original therefore, disappeared, and its place was supplied with a Greek translation, made probably under St. Matthew's own supervision. This circumstance doubtless furnished grounds for the opinion, held by some, that Greek was the original language of St. Matthew's Gospel.

It may not be out of place to bring forward the objection that in Matthew xxiii. 35, our Lord is represented as denouncing the hypocrisy of the Scribes and Pharisees in these words:—"That upon you

“may come all the just blood of Abel the just, even
“unto the blood of Zacharias, the son of Barachias,
“whom you killed between the temple and the
“altar.” Now Josephus, in his minute details of
the terrible siege of Jerusalem, mentions that a
certain Zacharias, son of Baruch, was killed by some
fanatics. There is nothing, however, in this state-
ment to prove that the writer of the *first Gospel* was
not St. Matthew. The murder to which our Lord
alluded is described in II. Paralipomenon (xxiv. 20,
21):—“The spirit of God then came upon Zacha-
“rias, the son of Joiada, the priest, and he stood in
“the sight of the people, and said to them: Thus
“saith the Lord God: Why transgress you the com-
“mandment of the Lord which will not be for your
“good, and have forsaken the Lord, to make him for-
“sake you? And they gathered themselves together
“against him, and stoned him at the King’s com-
“mandment in the court of the house of the Lord.”
Zacharias, the subject of this episode, was really the
son of Joiada, the High Priest; but because of his
eminent piety and zeal, our Lord spoke of him as
the son of Barachias, or “blessed of the Lord.”
This Zacharias was so zealous in rescuing his people
from the worship of idols that the Apostate King,
Joas, incited the Jews to murder him under circum-
stances of great cruelty between the vestibule of the
sanctuary and the altar of holocausts.

THE GOSPEL OF ST. MARK, which St. Augustine calls

a compendium of that of St. Matthew's, was written by St. Mark or John Mark (Acts xii. 12). In order to dedicate himself to the preaching of the Christian faith, St. Mark left his home at Jerusalem and joined St. Peter at Rome, where he acted as his secretary. He thus acquired an intimate knowledge of what the chief of the Apostles taught, and this, with the assistance and approval of his master he set forth in his Gospel, about 47 or 48 A.D., to gratify the converts at Rome. This incident we learn from St. Clement of Alexandria in the *Ecl. Hist.* of Eusebius (vi. 14). And indeed, the spirit of St. Peter is reflected in the pages of St. Mark's Gospel; for his denial of Christ is given most fully, while his confession of the divinity of Jesus, and the fact of his own elevation to the primacy of the whole Church is passed over in silence.

St. Mark begins with our Blessed Lord's royal descent. On this account, or perhaps because of the opening allusion to St. John the Baptist, crying in the desert: "Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make "straight his paths," commentators generally regard the lion mentioned by Ezechiel as typical of St. Mark. This Gospel St. Mark wrote in Greek, which was very generally understood all over the East.

The eminent annalist, Cardinal Baronius, was so struck with a very ancient Latin translation of this Gospel, which found its way from the archives of

Aquileia in 420 to the library of St. Mark in Venice, that he assumed it to be the *original* of St. Mark's Gospel. But the most competent authorities have pronounced the document to be part of a manuscript belonging to the fourth century.

According to the Bollandists St. Mark, after leaving Rome about 50 A.D., evangelized Egypt for twelve years, and then fixed his see at Alexandria. His success roused the the jealousy of Pagan priests, who tracked him in his flight to a hiding place near the sea. While celebrating Mass they dragged him out over sharp-pointed rocks till he was dead, and then flung his mangled corpse to the sea birds. Some pious souls, who witnessed the martyrdom, carried the body into the catacombs at Alexandria. It was afterwards laid in a marble tomb in the great church of that city, where it remained until 815, when the prosperous republic of Venice had it removed to the noble temple raised to the saint's memory in their beautiful city.

THE GOSPEL OF ST. LUKE:—St. Luke, an eminent medical man, gave up a lucrative practice to attach himself to St. Paul, who converted him to the faith of Christ at Antioch, about A.D. 53. His cultivated style proves him to have been a finished scholar, nor does this exhaust the list of his accomplishments, for in the Church of St. Mary, in the *Via Lata* at Rome, there is a celebrated painting of Our Blesssd Lady inscribed thus: "One of the

seven painted by St. Luke," which would entitle him to be ranked as an artist of merit.

About 60 or 61 A.D. St. Luke resolved "to set forth in order a narration of the things that have been accomplished among us; according as they have delivered them unto us, who from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word" (Luke i. 1 and 2). His object therefore, was to give from the information of eye-witnesses, a more detailed account than the two preceding Evangelists of what Jesus did and taught. Hence he relates the Annunciation of Our Blessed Lady, the Circumcision and Presentation of Our Blessed Lord, and various other important particulars, not recorded in the preceding Gospels. He intended his book to strengthen the faith of the converts from paganism, and for this reason he dedicated it to Theophilus, their most prominent representative in Antioch: "It seemed good to me also, having diligently attained to all things from the beginning, to write to thee in order most excellent Theophilus, that thou mayest know the verity of those words in which thou hast been instructed" (Luke i. 3 and 4).

The priestly office of our Saviour is the most prominent feature in this Gospel, and therefore, St. Luke is represented by the ox, or emblem of sacrifice.

ACTS OF THE APOSTLES:—So far there was no

connected history of the beginnings of the Church, and to meet this want St. Luke, a few years after completing his Gospel, wrote the *Acts of the Apostles*, a name derived from the fact that the first half is devoted to the labours of St. Peter; and in the second half St. Luke gives, from his own personal knowledge, a sketch of the missionary career of St. Paul.

ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL :—The author of this Gospel was called to the high office of Apostle, with his brother St. James, the greater, when our Lord “came into Galilee, preaching the Gospel of the kingdom of God” (Mark i. 14). Their father, Zebedee, was actually engaged in his own humble business of fishing on the sea of Galilee, when Jesus invited the two sons to follow Him. The simplicity of St. John's youth, and the life of angelic purity which he had embraced, made him very dear to our Blessed Lord, who permitted him to recline on His sacred breast, at the last supper. It was his virginity that gained for this favourite Apostle the inestimable privilege of attending the Mother of God at the foot of the cross, and by his sympathy lessening the bitterness of her great sorrow. “Thus,” says St. Jerome, “Jesus confided in his last moments His Virgin mother to the care of the virgin disciple.” And faithfully did St. John fulfil his charge during the years the Virgin Mother survived her Divine Son.

Asia Minor was the scene of St. John's labours. His success there attracted such public attention that in 95 A.D., during the persecution of Domitian, he was dragged a prisoner to Rome, where, having escaped unhurt from his immersion in a caldron of boiling oil, he was banished to Patmos. In 96 A.D., upon the death of the Emperor, he was allowed to return to Ephesus, where he found that in his absence, Ebion and Cerinthus, who denied the divinity of Christ, had succeeded in introducing their heresy among his flock. This attempt to corrupt the faith of his people so moved St. John that he determined to defeat it by every means in his power. This pious resolve found immediate effect from the following incident related by St. Jerome. The apostle was earnestly pressed by the brethren to write a Gospel. He consented, if, observing a common fast, they would all send up their prayers to God to attain for him all the grace necessary for this arduous undertaking, which being done, he, with the clearest and fullest revelation from Heaven, burst forth "In the beginning was "the Word, and the Word was with God." Some important details connected with the Passion and Resurrection, not found in the previous Gospels are supplied, and to remove the danger of misinterpretation he explains some mystical sayings of our Lord, like the "destroying of the Temple, and raising it up in three days."

This Gospel holds in the Vulgate the last place, because it is latest in the point of time. It is to be remarked that the sequence of facts and doctrines is not exactly the same in each of the four Gospels, for they were written by men differing widely in character and disposition, and each having some peculiar object to attain. This distinct individuality is also stamped upon whatever the Evangelists relate in common, but it never amounts to a contradiction. In short, the agreement between them is remarkable, and has been appropriately styled the *harmony of the Gospels*.

THE APOCALYPSE:—One Sunday morning during the term of his banishment in Patmos, St. John, while engaged in prayer, saw before him His Divine Saviour, clothed in a garment down to the feet. The vision changed to the throne of God, and the trials and triumphs of the Church of Christ were revealed to the Evangelist in grand symbolic imagery:—"After these things I looked, and behold "a door was opened in heaven, and the first voice "which I heard, as it were, of a trumpet speaking "with me, said: Come up hither and I will show "thee the things which must be done hereafter. And "immediately I was in the spirit, and behold there "was a throne set in heaven, and upon the throne "one sitting. And he that sat was to the sight like "the jasper and the sardine-stone: and there was "a rainbow round about the throne, in sight like

“unto an emerald. And round about the throne
“were four and twenty seats: and upon the seats
“four and twenty ancients sitting, clothed in white
“garments, and on their heads were crowns of gold.
“And from the throne proceeded lightnings and
“voices and thunders, and there were seven lamps
“burning before the throne, which are the seven
“spirits of God. And in the sight of the throne
“was, as it were, a sea of glass like to crystal: and
“in the midst of the throne and round about the
“throne were four living creatures full of eyes be-
“fore and behind” (Apocalypse iv. 1-6).

The mysterious book, sealed with the seven seals, being now produced, the Apostle learned that no man was worthy to open it. He wept bitterly, whereupon the Lamb appeared and began to undo the seals one by one. During this operation, horses of various colours appeared in view before him carrying knights in armour, who met in the shock of battle. Then came the removal of the fifth seal, followed by a petition from the army of martyrs, praying punishment on the persecutors of the Church.

At this stage the sixth seal was unfastened, laying open the awful accompaniments which make the *last Judgment* so terrible:—“And I saw, when he
“had opened the sixth seal, and behold there was a
“great earthquake, and the sun became black as
“sack-cloth of hair: and the whole moon became as

“blood : And the stars from heaven fell upon
“the earth as the fig-tree casteth its green figs when
“it is shaken by a great wind: And the heaven
“departed as a book folded up: and every mountain,
“and the islands were moved out of their places”
(Apocalypse vi. 12-14). There was profound
silence after the removal of the seventh seal, when
the seven angels announced, with loud trumpets, a
visitation of seven desolating plagues, and then came
the vision of the woman clothed with the sun, which
was followed by the war between the Church
and Antichrist:—“And I saw a beast coming up
“out of the sea, having seven heads and ten horns,
“and upon his horns ten diadems, and upon his
“heads names of blasphemy” (Apocalypse xiii. 1).

To this fearful picture succeeded that of “The
“virgins who follow the Lamb whithersoever he
“goeth, having his name and the name of his
“Father written on their foreheads to the number
“of 144,000.” The triumph of these virgins over
the “beast” is celebrated by the singing of a new
canticle to the accompaniment of many harps ; while
the doom that awaits the wicked is set down in
these words : “And the third Angel followed them,
“saying with a loud voice : If any man shall adore
“the beast and his image, and receive his character
“in his forehead, or in his hand. He also shall
“drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is
“mingled with pure wine in the cup of his wrath,

“and shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in
“the sight of the holy Angels, and in the sight of
“the Lamb. And the smoke of their torments
“shall ascend up for ever and ever, neither have
“they rest day nor night, who have adored the
“beast, and his image, and whosoever receiveth the
“character of his name” (Apocalypse xiv. 9-11).

To complete this appalling description of the punishment of the wicked, the seven vials of the wrath of God, are poured out upon the earth, and Babylon, or the world of sin, after being drenched with the blood of martyrs is destroyed in the midst of great rejoicing.

Christ's triumphant victory in the end, and the imperishable joys of the heavenly Jerusalem, make up the closing visions of this wonderful book, which “possesses,” according to St. Jerome, “as many sacraments as words.” All this Jesus commanded St. John “to write in a book for the seven Churches of Asia Minor.” The Apostle did so with the following dedication: “The Revelation of
“Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to make
“known to his servants the things which must
“shortly come to pass: and signified, sending by
“His angel to His servant, John, who hath given
“testimony to the Word of God, and the testimony
“of Jesus Christ, what things soever he hath seen
(Apocalypse i. 1-2.) The weight of St. John's own name is appended to prevent the smallest

suspicion of incredibility, for he alone was in the position to address with authority the Bishops of the seven Churches of Asia Minor. His identity is more distinctly defined in the Greek manuscripts where the book is styled: "The Apocalypse of St. John, the theologian," and in the oldest Latin Versions, in which it is mentioned as "The Apocalypse of St. John the Apostle."





CHAPTER II.

THE EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL.

St. Paul's antecedents—His conversion—His three Apostolic journeys—Epistle to the Romans—First and second Epistles to the Corinthians—Epistle to the Galatians—Epistle to the Ephesians—Epistle to the Phillippians—Epistle to the Colossians—First and Second Epistle to the Thessalonians—The two Epistles to Timothy and one to Titus—Epistle to Philemon—Epistle to the Hebrews.

ST. PAUL:—The fourteen New Testament books, following in order the Acts of the Apostles, were written by St. Paul, who says that he was “of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, an Hebrew of the Hebrews” (Philippians iii. 5); and again:—“I am a Jew, born at Tarsus, in Cilicia . . . Men, brethren, I am a Pharisee, the son of Pharisees” (Acts xxii. 3, and xxiii. 6). The Pharisees were those Jews who publicly affected great austerity in the practice of their religion, but under a sanctimonious exterior concealed a depraved heart. The parents of St. Paul belonged to this sect, and resolved to make their son a leading advocate of its principles. With this view they sent him from his native Tarsus to Jerusalem, where he studied under

Gamaliel, the most eminent teacher of the Jewish law at the time. He joined earnestly in the work of extirpating the Christian religion, and after assisting at the martyrdom of St. Stephen, he pursued the converts at Jerusalem into their hiding places. Finding that some escaped to Damascus, he was soon in pursuit. On the way God struck him down in the midst of awful accompaniments in which he heard our Blessed Lord address him:—"Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? . . . Now the men who went in company with him stood amazed, hearing indeed a voice, but seeing no man. And Saul arose from the ground, and when his eyes were opened he saw nothing. But they leading him by the hands, brought him to Damascus, and he was there three days without sight, and he did neither eat nor drink" (Acts ix. 4-9).

While Saul was still suffering from his blindness his Divine Master in a vision, directed Ananias, a holy man then in Damascus, to proceed to the house and lay hands upon him that he might recover his sight, saying:—"For this man is to me a vessel of election to carry my name before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel" (Acts ix. 15). Called thus in a special manner to the Apostolate, St. Paul for the remainder of his eventful life never wearied in his great mission of carrying the name of Christ before the Gentiles. He visited all the Synagogues in Damascus, and there by boldly "preaching

Jesus that he is the son of God," aroused such a strong feeling against him amongst the entire Jewish community that he felt obliged to withdraw into the desert for three years. After this term he reappeared in Damascus, and renewing his preaching he became again the object of Jewish hatred:—"And when many days were past, the Jews consulted together to kill him . . . And they watched the gates also day and night that they might kill him. But the disciples taking him in the night, conveyed him away by the wall, letting him down in a basket" (Acts ix. 23-24). The fugitive having reached Jerusalem, was greeted by St. Peter with a warm welcome; but while praying in the temple he heard from above a voice which said:—"Make haste, and get thee quickly out of Jerusalem, because they will not receive thy testimony concerning me" (Acts xx. 18). Immediately he obeyed, and departed from the great city to revisit the scenes of his youth. Here he was cheered by the unexpected arrival of St. Barnabas, on his way to take charge of the congregation, established by St. Peter at Antioch. St. Barnabas pressed St. Paul to join him in his mission, and drew such a vivid picture of the wants of the Church at Antioch, that the heart of the listener readily responded to the invitation. The zeal with which the two servants of God applied themselves to their holy work was speedily and abundantly blessed, for in the brief

space of one year the converts at Antioch became so numerous as to form an important section of the population under the distinctive name of Christians. In these circumstances the Divine will was intimated to Saul and Barnabas to seek new pastures:—

“Now there were in the Church which was at
“Antioch prophets and doctors, among whom was
“Barnabas and Simon, who was called Niger, and
“Lucius of Cyrene, and Manahen, who was the
“foster-brother of Herod the tetrarch, and Saul.
“And as they were ministering to the Lord, and
“fasting, the Holy Ghost said to them: separate me
“Saul and Barnabas for the work whereunto I have
“taken them. Then they, fasting and praying, and
“imposing their hands upon them, sent them away”
(Acts xiii. 1-3). Fresh with this grace, and accompanied by St. Mark, who had joined his cousin, Barnabas, they started upon the three famous *Apostolic journeys*, which make up St. Paul’s missionary career. In the island of Cyprus, which was soon reached, they had the happiness of receiving into the Church the pro-consul or governor. The name of this distinguished convert was *Paulus*, which some think, was adopted by the Apostle on this occasion. Leaving Cyprus, St. Paul and his companions planted the standard of the cross in Perge of Pamphylia, Antioch of Pisidia, Iconium, Lystra and Derbe, and so ended the first of the Apostle’s missionary expeditions. St. Paul was now resting at Antioch, where Jewish

converts came pouring in. These were filled with the pride of their race, and St. Peter, who happened to be in Antioch at the time, feared they would, on the slightest provocation, revive the controversy, which had been so happily closed in the Council of Jerusalem (A.D. 51), where it was authoritatively decided that the Mosaic observances had no force in the Christian dispensation. To meet this danger of again dividing the Christian community, St. Peter left the company of the Gentile Christians, and gave up the use of unclean meats, inducing St. Barnabas to do the same. St. Paul regarded this proceeding as an indiscretion, and without in the least infringing on the respect due to the supreme authority of the prince of the Apostles, mentioned the matter to him in words of humble remonstrance: "I withstood him to the face because he was to be blamed." (Galatians ii. 11). St. Gregory the Great, referring to this incident says: "He, St. Peter, forgot his "own dignity for fear of losing any degree of "humility. He afterwards commended the Epistles "of St. Paul as full of wisdom, though we "read in them something which seems derogatory "from his honour. But this lover of truth rejoiced "that all should know that he had been re- "proved, and should believe the reproof was just" (2 Homily on Ezechiel).

In this affair some search in vain for an argu-

ment to support a fanciful theory in favour with a certain school of Rationalists. They say that a violent rupture took place between St. Peter and St. Paul, and one of the causes which led to it was this very question of the converts to Christianity being bound by the law of Moses. This difference was never healed, they say, and it extended to the other Apostles, who did not carry on a calm and friendly dispute, but reviled and persecuted each other with the utmost acrimony. They became in fact, two adverse factions—the Pauline, or the followers of St. Paul, and the *Pillar-Apostles*, a name given in the Epistle to the Galatians (ii. 9) to St. Peter, St. John, and St. James. But evidence of this rupture, and of these contending factions, there is none in the present instance. St. Peter received this blame “to the face” as perfectly just, and made it the occasion of a splendid proof of his humility, as St. Augustine reminds us: “St. Peter sets an example of a more wonderful and difficult virtue. For it is a much easier task for one to see what to reprehend in another, and to put him in mind of a fault than for us publicly to acknowledge our own faults and to correct them. How heroic a virtue is it to be willing to be rebuked by another, by an inferior, and in sight of the world” (Homily on the Galatians ii). There is no foundation for the existence of this seditious spirit among the Apostles. St. Paul himself says:

“James, and Cephas and John, who seemed to be
“pillars, gave to me and Barnabas the right hands
“of Fellowship” (Galatians ii. 9).

St. Paul had now rested sufficiently, and it was time to resume his *second Apostolic journey*. St. Barnabas believed the voice of God called him to Cyprus, where his cousin, Mark, was to meet him, and thus he and St. Paul, the partners of so many joys and sorrows, separated at the call of duty, to use the apt and graceful remark of St. John Chrysostom :—“Both sought only the greater glory
“of God, and they parted in perfect charity” (Homily xxxiv. on the Acts of the Apostles). Shortly after the Council of Jerusalem, Silas, or Sylvanus, was sent to assist in the mission, and taking him, together with St. Timothy, a native of Lystra, in Lycaonia, St. Paul evangelized the extensive provinces of Phrygia and Galatia. He now made Troas his centre, and thither St. Luke followed. This learned convert conceived a deep affection for St. Paul at Antioch, in Syria, his native place, and finding it growing stronger by distance, he left his home and the lucrative practice of his profession to share with the Apostle the holy work of saving souls.

From Troas, St. Paul, accompanied by St. Silas, St. Timothy and St. Luke, sailed to Macedonia. In Philippi their preaching produced a rich harvest, and in Thessalonica it won so many that it gave promise

of absorbing the entire population. The Jews, therefore, incited the mob to make a murderous assault on the missionaries, who, by hiding in the house of one Jason, were able in the night to escape to the neighbouring city of Berea. Here St. Sylvanus took charge, while St. Timothy returned to Thessalonica, and St Paul's own destination was Athens, face to face with the greatest scholars of the age that he might bring them captive to the saving truth, which surpasseth all human understanding. Among the learned bodies of Athens were the Judges of the Supreme Court who presided over the Areopagus, and here St. Paul ventured to address them on the resurrection of the body. They proposed to hear him a second time ; but these proud philosophers hardened their hearts against St. Paul's persuasive reasoning, so that the only one of them, who had the courage to embrace the Christian faith was St. Dionysius. In these circumstances St. Paul turned his thoughts to Corinth, and here he brought his second Apostolic journey to a close. Ephesus with its central position, and fine harbour was the great mart of western Asia, and foreigners came there in crowds for purposes of trade. Here St. Paul spent a considerable part of his third and last mission, and this was, perhaps, the most fruitful period of his Apostleship. In the extraordinary success, which thus attended the Gospel in Ephesus, Apollo, a

very fervent convert, had a large share. He no sooner embraced the faith in Alexandria, his native city, than a warm zeal for the cause of Christ, filled his heart, and coming to Ephesus he there "taught diligently the things that are of Jesus" (Acts xviii. 25).

The interests of the Church in Corinth again demanded the presence of St. Paul, and he set out immediately, in company with his favourite disciple Titus, whom he had converted during the progress of his first Apostolic journey. On his way back to Ephesus St. Paul visited Crete, and made Titus Bishop of that Church. After two years St. Paul retired from Ephesus leaving St. Timothy Bishop there, and after passing through Macedonia and Greece he paid a long farewell visit to Corinth. Then, seeing that his life was no longer safe in that place from the intense hostility of the unbelieving Jews, he left abruptly for Macedonia, and thence by ship to Troas. Here his mission brought an immense blessing, for though it could not be extended beyond a month, a vast number of souls were converted to God.

From Troas the Apostle crossed the Ægean Sea, and landed at Miletus, a prosperous port about thirty miles from Ephesus, where the clergy of that city came, and understanding that their beloved Paul was about to leave them, so as to see his face no more, they followed him in a crowd to the ship,

which was to bear him away, and weeping and falling on his neck they kissed him (Acts xx. 36-38).

Cæsarea was the next stage on the Apostle's journey, and here the Prophet, Agabus, warned him not to go up to Jerusalem, for there he was sure to encounter severe trials. But St. Paul would not turn aside, and his fearless answer to Agabus is worthy of the great Apostle of the Gentiles. "I am ready," he exclaimed, "not only to be bound, but also to die for the name of Jesus Christ" (Acts xxi. 13).

St. James the Less was Bishop of Jerusalem at the time, and gave St. Paul a very kind reception on his arrival there. This holy prelate knew well that the Jews of Jerusalem entertained enmity towards St. Paul, and he, therefore, prevailed upon the Apostle to disarm their malice by publicly appearing in the Temple, and conforming with the rites of purification in obedience to his Nazarite vow. He did so, but the very sight of him, even in carrying out their own ritual, goaded the Jews into such fury that they would have murdered him had not the captain of the Roman guard hurried up and dispersed the threatening crowd. He then arrested St. Paul, but permitted him to address the people from the steps of the castle. This was done in Hebrew, with a power and eloquence that excited the admiration of all who heard him. But, as "Some of the Jews gathered together, and bound

“ themselves under a curse, saying, that they would “ neither eat nor drink, till they killed Paul ” (Acts xxiii. 12), he was sent by night, under a strong escort, to the Roman Governor of Cæsarea, who had him brought up and unjustly remanded several times during two years. At last, in the exercise of his right as a Roman citizen, St. Paul appealed to the Emperor, and to Rome he was accordingly sent, accompanied by his dear friends and fellow-labourers, St. Luke and Aristarchus. On the voyage thither his ship was violently tossed by the winds and the waves, until she became a total wreck on the sands of Melita (Malta); but all on board were saved, a fact which made St. Chrysostom exclaim : “ Behold “ what it is to live in the company of a saint.” His stay on this island during the spring of A.D. 61, St. Paul turned to good account in evangelizing the inhabitants. From Malta, St. Paul, still wearing his chain, came to Rome, where he was allowed to dwell “ for two whole years in his own hired house,” and in that interval he made many distinguished converts, even from the Imperial palace : “ All the saints salute you, especially they that “ are of Cæsar’s household ” (Philippians iv. 22). Having completed his first term of imprisonment St. Paul is represented as bringing the message of salvation to Spain. St. Clement I., who was then Pope, states (1 Corinthians v.), that St. Paul penetrated to the confines of the West, which is supposed to

be Spain, especially as in a mutilated document of undisputed authority, and given by Muratori in his *Italian Antiquities of the Middle Ages*, p. 854, mention is made of St. Paul's expedition to Spain. The Apostle, however, is soon again in Greece strengthening the missions there. At Corinth he met St. Peter, when the news of Nero's edict against the Christians of Rome reached them, and they resolved to go there at once to encourage their afflicted people. At Rome St. Paul went fearlessly to the post of danger, and by his active attendance on the Christian martyrs drew upon himself the attention of the persecutors. He was sent to prison, and soon afterwards suffered martyrdom, in A.D. 67 or 68.

EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS:—In Rome, as elsewhere, the Jewish converts were boasting of having deserved the grace of vocation to the true faith and justification. In this they despised their Gentile brethren, who angrily retorted by pointing to the base ingratitude to God of which the Jews had been guilty, while their own fault was comparatively a light one, because they sinned in ignorance. After this fashion, severe reproaches were freely exchanged, both sides assuming that they had a right to claim the blessing of being in the true Church as merited. It was to explode this false doctrine, as well as to remove the new danger, arising from it to the peace and growth of the infant

Church, that in A.D. 58, St. Paul indited to the faithful of Rome this, the most doctrinal of his Epistles, and the foremost among the Pauline Epistles. In it he explains how justification is a gratuitous gift, given by God through the merits of Jesus Christ. He shows that the Jews sinned grievously against the law of Moses, and the Gentiles against the law of nature, so that both required a Redeemer, by whom all are sanctified and brought to eternal salvation without any previous merit of their own.

Faith, he says, is needed, not as a meritorious cause, but a necessary disposition for the reception of this grace of justification, which imposes upon those to whom it is given the obligation of leading lives, "not according to the flesh, but according to the spirit." Let them therefore, he adds, be faithful to this solemn duty, and most certainly companionship with Jesus in heaven will be their inheritance, for they are "the elect of God." Such is the assurance given by the Apostle, and it is based on the doctrine of election:—"For whom he fore-knew he also predestinated to be made conformable to the image of his son, that he might be the first-born amongst many brethren. And whom he predestinated, them he also called. And whom he called, them he also justified. And whom he justified, them he also glorified" (Romans viii. 29, 30). God, who not only wishes all men to be saved,

but supplies the means to this end, knows even our future free acts depending on a condition:—"Wo
"to thee Corozain, wo to thee Bethsaida; for if in
"Tyre and Sidon had been wrought the miracles
"that have been wrought in you, they had long ago
"done penance in sackcloth and ashes" (Matthew
xi. 21). By this knowledge God is aware from all
eternity that a certain number who are making good
use of His aids to salvation will be infallibly saved if
He helps their fainting free wills with a special grace.
God decrees from all eternity to bestow upon them
this special grace, and thus He predestinates them to
eternal life. The giving of this special grace is
entirely independent of any claim on the part of the
elect, but their crown of glory in the end is regarded
by some Catholic theologians as a reward for good
and faithful service, and not at all gratuitous or
given without merit. It must be also observed that
God does not give this special and gratuitous assist-
ance except to those whom He foresees performing
good works, that is making good use of the means
supplied to them gratuitously by Him to work out
their salvation.

St. Paul pronounces the Jews as a body to be
excluded from this justification because of their per-
sistent and perverse rejection of the Gospel. At the
end of the world, however, when the measure of
the Gentile conversion shall be filled up, Israel will
believe and be saved:—"For I would not have you

“ignorant, brethren, of this mystery (lest you should
“be wise in your own conceits) that blindness in
“part has happened in Israel, until the fulness of
“the Gentiles should come in” (Romans xi. 25).

This important exposition of faith was most fittingly addressed to the converts at Rome, because they belonged to the mighty centre from which all the nations of the world were directed. Rome too, possessed the premier Church of Christendom, since it was founded by St. Peter himself (Irenæus against Heresies, Book VII., chapter 6), and had already attained to a flourishing condition.

FIRST EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS :—Among the Epistles of St. Paul this to the Corinthians is placed second in the New Testament, because in the importance of the subject and the position of the persons addressed, it is second only to the Epistle to the Romans.

When St. Paul was at Ephesus about A.D. 57, prosecuting his third Apostolic journey, he heard that an effort was being made by some among the Corinthian converts to divide the seamless robe of Christ by creating a dissentient element within the Catholic body on the pretence of following favourite preachers. Condemning this he wrote :—“The
“foolish things of the world hath God chosen that
“He may confound the wise ; and the weak things
“of the world hath God chosen that He may con-
“found the strong” (1 Corinthians i. 27). And in

order to show the magnitude of this evil he explains the doctrine of the unity of the Church by the familiar illustration of the consummate harmony existing between the members of the human body. The antidote he offers against this tendency towards division is charity, which he eulogises in brilliant language.

Turning then to the luxurious habits of these Corinthians the Apostle pronounces the sentence of excommunication on one who was living publicly in incest. Warning them against the sin of the flesh he tells them to put on the snow-white robes of purity, and urges this in a train of reasoning that is very beautiful:—"Know you not that your bodies are the members of Christ . . ." (1 Corinthians vi. 15-20). This brought St. Paul to discuss the relative merits of virginity and matrimony in answer to a request forwarded to him by this people. He extols the excellence of marriage, but declares it to be inferior to the state of virginity (1 Corinthians vii. 1-9).

Lastly, to spur the Corinthians to their duty in these particulars, the Apostles sets forth the cheering doctrine of the resurrection of the body:—"Behold I tell you a mystery. We shall all indeed "rise again ; but we shall not all be changed. . . . "And when this mortal hath put on immortality, "then shall come to pass the saying that is written : "*Death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where*

“is thy victory? O death, where is thy sting?”
(1 Corinthians xv. 51-55).

SECOND EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS:—Towards the end of this same year A.D. 57, St. Paul sent Titus to Corinth, in order to ascertain on the spot the effect produced by the first Epistle to the Corinthians, and thence to come on direct to Troas. Titus announced that the first Epistle to the Corinthians wrought a most marked change for the better on that people. This he said, was the more consoling, because certain jealous intruders did all they could to poison the minds of the Corinthian converts generally against the Epistle. To expose their fraud and malice the Second Epistle to the Corinthians was written, which opens with sentiments of the tenderest charity towards this erring people:—“For out of much affliction and
“anguish of heart, I wrote to you with many
“tears; not that you should be made sorrowful,
“but that you might know the charity I have
“more abundantly towards you” (2nd Epist. to the Corinthians ii. 4). The writer goes on to tell them that he adopted a severe tone in his first Epistle that a bitter draught might work a cure, and the result was as he anticipated (2 Corinthians vii. 8, 9).

To his labours he now turns (2 Corinthians xi. 24-31) in no spirit of vain boasting, but to defend the honour of Jesus Christ whose Apostle he thus fearlessly asserted himself to be. The false teachers,

who had been calumniating him, he denounced with terrible severity:—"For such false Apostles are "deceitful workmen, transforming themselves into "the Apostles of Christ. And no wonder; for "Satan himself transformeth himself into an angel "of light" (2 Corinthians xi. 13, 14). And he concludes by expressing a strong hope of seeing them very soon, but in the meantime:—"I "write these things, being absent, that, being pre- "sent, I may not deal more severely, according to "the power which the Lord hath given me unto "edification, and not unto destruction. For the rest, "brethren, rejoice, be perfect, take exhortation, be "of one mind, have peace; and the God of peace "and of love shall be with you . . . The grace of "our Lord Jesus Christ, and the charity of God, "and the communication of the Holy Ghost be with "you all. Amen" (2 Corinthians xiii. 10-13).

EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS:—The most prominent figure in the religious traditions of the Ephesians was the goddess, Diana. The story was that Jupiter with his own hands made a colossal statue of this his favourite daughter, and dropped it from heaven into Ephesus, which he had chosen to be the city specially devoted to her worship. The Ephesians in their gratitude built a temple, worthy of their sacred trust, and thither pilgrims flocked, while every one of this immense pagan throng procured a small silver model of the miraculous

statue of the goddess, so that there was a brisk sale for these articles. It is not hard, therefore, to realize the keen sense of wrong that seized this people against St. Paul, when they began to perceive that his preaching there was fast reducing their profits. Their resentment knew no bounds, and Demetrius, a leader amongst them, by his inflammatory harangues succeeded in lashing the Ephesians into great fury against the Apostle. Men ran about wildly, mingling threats of death to him, with the fierce shouts of:—"Great is Diana of the Ephesians." It was when this imminent danger to his life had passed that St. Paul heard at Ephesus that an organized attempt was being made in Galatia to rob the people of their faith by inducing them to embrace the errors of Judaism. The authors of this were designing Jews from Palestine, who tried to persuade the simple-minded Galatians that St. Paul, from whom they had just received the Gospel, was no divinely-appointed Apostle, but an impostor who quarrelled with St. Peter on the question of circumcision. St. Paul immediately wrote to the Galatians the most incisive of his Epistles. After vindicating his Apostleship he tells them that even to have listened to the false statements of his relentless enemies was evidence of their inconstancy. He censures this weakness with much emphasis, and to fortify them against it in future he lays down that salvation can

be obtained not by the precepts of the ceremonial law of the Jews, but by faith in Christ. This is the true faith which he taught them, and he declares :—
“Though we or an angel from heaven, preach a
“Gospel to you besides that which we have preached
“to you, let him be anathema” (Galatians i. 8).
Upon the truths of this saving faith there is no difference, he says, between himself and the other Apostles, and, touching his remonstrance to St. Peter at Antioch, he gives a true account of that incident. In conclusion, he points out how Christ had emancipated them from the servitude of the Mosaic law, and he exhorts them therefore, “to
“stand fast, and be not held again under the yoke
“of bondage . . . for in Christ Jesus neither circum-
“cision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision ; but
“faith that worketh by charity” (Galatians v. 1-6).

EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS :—It was during St. Paul’s first imprisonment at Rome (A.D. 62), that Epaphras, Bishop of Colossa, came to comfort the Apostle in his chains. The holy prelate in the course of his visit mentioned that some designing Jews contrived to insinuate themselves among his flock, and attempted to weaken their faith by representing that it was necessary to observe the Mosaic ordinances, and that the great mystery of the Redemption had been effected not by Christ but by angels. St. Paul suspected that the false teachers, who had done so much harm in Colossa, were sure to make

their way to Ephesus, and he immediately set about his Epistle to the Ephesians, to secure the faith of that large and important Church from this threatened invasion. The beginning or doctrinal part of his letter is devoted chiefly to Redemption, justification, predestination, and in the end or moral part, the Apostle dwells on the unity, charity, obedience, humility, and other virtues demanded by the profession of the Christian faith. His exposition of the unity of the Church (iv. 11-17), and of the sanctity as well as mystical signification of marriage (v. 22, 23), is given with great force.

EPISTLE TO THE PHILIPPIANS :—It was probably in some part of A.D. 63, that St. Paul at Rome was gladdened by the gateful action of the Philippians, who were the best fruits of his mission in Macedonia. They sent their devoted Bishop, Epaphroditus, to tell him, how deeply they felt for his sufferings. In delivering this welcome message, Epaphroditus, accompanied it with a good report of the faithful of his diocese. There was, however, a spirit of dissension beginning to show itself, due partly to pride, and partly to the unbelieving Jewish emissaries, who were trying to tamper with their faith. To stop this mischief, and to recall this earnest people to their fervour, St. Paul wrote his Epistle to them. It contains a tender acknowledgment of their loving sympathy, and an expression of his sincere hope that he may soon be free to

come and thank them in person. He congratulates them on what he heard, from their beloved Bishop, of their edifying obedience to the duties of religion, and prays fervently that they may persevere in this holy course, so as to reach that state of perfection, which he briefly sketches. They must remember always, he adds, that salvation is not from the law of Moses, but from faith in Christ Jesus, and therefore, to encourage in any way the advances of those false teachers, who were going about amongst them, would render them grievously at fault. They must fight the good fight after his own example, and their reward will be eternal.

EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.:—The false doctrines against which the Epistle to the Ephesians was directed, were being actively propagated by Jewish emissaries among the faithful of Colossa. The news saddened the heart of St. Paul, who was a prisoner in Rome at the time, and in his anxious solicitude he wrote his Epistle to the Colossians. In it he goes over the same ground as that covered by the Epistle to the Ephesians, namely, the necessity of faith in Christ Jesus:—"In whom we have redemption through His blood, the remission of sins" (Colossians i. 14), and he seals this with the following admonition:—"Beware lest any man cheat you by philosophy, and vain deceit, according to the tradition of men, according to the

“elements of the world, and not according to “Christ” (Colossians ii. 8).

FIRST EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS :—Thessalonica, which St. Paul evangelized in the course of his second Apostolic mission, was most devoted to his teaching. Its first pastor was St. Timothy, who visited Corinth to see St. Paul there about A.D. 53 or 54, and assured him that the Thessalonians dearly cherished his memory, and wished to see him once more among them. The first Epistle to the Thessalonians is an acknowledgment of their tender message, and in point of time is the first of the Pauline Epistles. In it St. Paul, after offering his warmest congratulations to this fervent people on their unswerving fidelity to the faith in such troubled times, reciprocates the kind assurances conveyed to him by their good bishop. He promises to take an early opportunity of coming to Thessalonica, but in the meantime earnestly exhorts them to persevere in the exercise of charity towards one another. He concludes by instructing them as to the resurrection of the dead and the time of the judgment, about which they were unduly agitated. They ought to remember, he says, that the loving ones, whose death they mourn with an excessive grief, seeing that they departed in peace with God will rise again in a more glorious state to dwell for ever in heaven (Thessalonians iv. 12-17). Then, as to the “day of the Lord,” it is idle, he says, to specu-

late, for the only thing certain is that it will come "as a thief in the night." But they must not lose heart at this provided they make their lives in harmony with the precepts and counsels he gives them.

THE SECOND EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS :—
The faithful of Thessalonica were deeply touched by the tender solicitude which the Apostle evinced towards them in this letter, when their minds were again unsettled by a document, circulated under the name of St. Paul, announcing in language full of panic that the end of the world was imminent. This was the work of an impostor, and when the apostle knew of its existence he effectually exposed the base deceit in his second Epistle to the Thessalonians. He was grieved he said, at the wicked imposition practised upon them, and without losing a moment he wished to re-assure them by letter that their fears about the last day being near at hand were groundless. It would not come unexpectedly, but be duly heralded by certain events preceded by "the man of sin" (2 Thessalonians ii. 3). Instead of permitting themselves, therefore, to be affrighted by phantoms they must endeavour to be earnest in the performance of their duties. Then follows an eloquent exhortation to avoid associating with sinners, and to "hold the traditions which you have learned, whether by word, or by "our Epistle" (2 Thessalonians ii. 14).

THE TWO EPISTLES TO TIMOTHY, AND ONE TO TITUS :—The conflagration, kindled by the silversmiths in Ephesus, though quenched in the flame still lived in the embers. Under these circumstances St. Paul thought it wise for the present to withdraw to Macedonia and appoint St. Timothy Bishop of Ephesus. This holy disciple, though unwilling to accept the burthen of the episcopal office, obeyed the command of his superior without a murmur, as Titus did shortly before when promoted to the see of Crete. St. Paul loved these two young bishops with a strong affection, and now that he saw them weighed down with the heavy responsibilities which his hands had imposed upon them, he resolved to strengthen and console them by reasonable encouragement and advice. This he did by Epistles respectively addressed to these two prelates, one to St. Timothy, being written from Macedonia, and a second afterwards from behind his prison bars at Rome. These Epistles, especially the one to Titus and the first to Timothy were evidently written hastily, for they have not that finish and idiomatic ease that marked other writings of the Apostle. They are truly the earnest expression of a heart burning with a tender love, and are known as his *pastoral* letters, because in them he holds up the mirror to the good and faithful pastor, as St. Augustine remarks in Book iv., ch. xvi. of his work on Christian Doctrine :—“The man engaged in the work

“of saving souls ought to meditate on these Epistles “day and night.” The apostle assures Saints Timothy and Titus that the burden of the episcopal office will have no terrors for them, provided they attend, above all, to their own holiness of life. Without a solid substratum of personal sanctity, abilities of the highest order can effect but little towards the saving of souls. A pastor may be gifted with remarkable natural endowments, he may be an erudite theologian, deeply versed in ecclesiastical and secular learning, and may have devoted a vast amount of time to various works of the ministry, but all this will not suffice unless the Lord give the increase, and most assuredly God will not bless the work of any one unless he is perfect in the spirit of holiness. So too a pastor may be filled with zeal in hearing confessions, preaching, catechizing, visiting schools, building churches, attending to the sick. He may be most devoted to all these admirable duties, and neglect the work of his own personal sanctification. But how is this to be attained? Chiefly by mental and vocal prayer:—“Meditate,” St. Paul writes to Timothy, “upon “these things, be wholly in these things: that thy “profiting may be manifest to all” (1 Timothy iv. 15), and in another place:—“I will, therefore, that men “pray in every place, lifting up pure hands without “anger and contention” (1 Timothy ii. 8).

Another powerful means for quickening this spirit

of holiness is a persistent and untiring application to study. Not only has it a refining influence on the individual, but it draws away the mind from things which will harm it to objects of a rational nature. It creates in most persons a disgust and abhorrence towards excesses, which otherwise would drag men under their influence. And what is peculiarly beneficial to a minister of God, reading generates in him a hatred for the miserable tone of conversation which obtains in the world, and no man can feel the want of society, who has a fondness for good books. St. Timothy is, therefore, exhorted to : “Attend unto reading, “to exhortation, and to doctrine” (1 Timothy ix. 13), and even the particular kind of study is suggested : “And because from thy infancy thou hast known “the Holy Scriptures, which can instruct thee to “salvation, by the faith which is in Christ Jesus. “All Scripture, inspired by God, is profitable to “teach, to reprove, to correct, to instruct in justice. “That the man of God may be perfect, furnished to “every good work” (1 Timothy iii. 15-17).

But the good pastor must be active also, ever labouring :—“Labour as a good soldier of Christ “Jesus” (2 Timothy ii. 3), and again :—“I charge “thee before God and Jesus Christ . . . preach the “word, be instant in season, out of season ; reprove, “entreat, rebuke, in all patience and doctrine” (2 Timothy iv. 1, 2). There is also a special admonition against avarice :—“But godliness with content-

“ment is great gain. For we brought nothing into
“this world, and certainly we can carry nothing out.
“But having food and wherewith to be covered,
“with these we are content” (1 Timothy vi. 6-8).
The Epistle to Titus is written on the same lines as
the two Epistles to Timothy.

EPISTLE TO PHILEMON:—St. Paul in his Epistle to the Colossians mentions that he forwarded it by Tychicus:—“Our dearest brother and faithful
“minister, and fellow servant in the Lord . . .
“whom I have sent to you for this same purpose,
“that he may know the things that concern you
“and comfort your hearts” (Colossians iv. 8).
Under protection of Tychicus St. Paul also sent Onesimus, just converted by him in Rome. This was a poor slave who ran away from his master, Philemon, a respectable citizen of Colossæ, to whom he is now restored by the Apostle with a tender appeal in his *Epistle to Philemon*, to receive back Onesimus into his service and treat him kindly:—
“Not now as a servant, but instead of a servant, a
“most dear brother.”

EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS:—This Epistle was written by St. Paul in his prison cell at Rome shortly before his martyrdom in A.D. 67 or 68. The Hebrews to whom it was addressed, though they had embraced the Christian faith, were stubbornly insisting upon the doctrine that any convert to Christianity, in order to be saved, must enter the Church

through the door of the Mosaic ceremonies. This contention was false, and calculated to deter numbers of Gentiles from becoming Christians, so that St. Paul deemed it necessary to set them right. At the same time to make the faith of these Jewish converts strong in the face of sore and pressing trials, he places before them in striking contrast the infinite superiority of the Christian over the Mosaic dispensation. The Jewish religion, he points out, was promulgated by Moses, its high priest was mortal and peccable, its sacrifices were mere figures and ineffectual to cancel sin, but Jesus is not only the author of the Gospel; He is the victim of its sacrifice, and His blood washeth away the sins of the world.

In the last chapter he asks them to "Pray for us. "For we trust we have a good conscience, being "willing to behave ourselves well in all things. "And I beseech you the more to do this that I may "be restored to you the sooner" (Hebrews xiii. 18, 19). The hope of release so fondly expressed here was never realised, for the Apostle soon after received his martyr's crown.





CHAPTER III.

THE SEVEN CATHOLIC EPISTLES.

St. James, *the Less*—His Epistle—St. Peter—His first and second Epistles—First, second, and third Epistles of St. John—Epistle of St. Jude.

THE name *Catholic Epistles* was adopted in the Church from the time of Eusebius, the historian, to indicate those New Testament books, which were, with the exception of the second and third Epistles of St. John, addressed to the faithful throughout the world.

THE EPISTLE OF ST. JAMES THE APOSTLE:—According to St. Augustine this epistle was an answer to false conclusions, drawn from the epistle to the Romans (iii. 28), and the epistle to the Galatians (iii. 8-11). Now, the date of these Scriptures was A.D. 58, and St. James the Greater, suffered martyrdom in A.D. 54, so that the writer of this Epistle must be St. James, sometimes called “the brother of the Lord” (Galatians i. 19). It was common among the Jews to speak of near blood-relations as brothers:—“Is not this the carpenter’s son? Is not his mother called Mary, and

“his brethren James, and Joseph, and Simon, and “Jude” (Mathew xiii. 55).

St. James, “the brother of the Lord,” was sur-named *the Less*, to distinguish him from St. James, the Greater. Not only does St. Paul in his Epistle to the Galatians (ii. 9), speak of him as one of the Apostles “who seemed to be pillars;” but his eminent sanctity gained for him the title of the *Just*. The popular voice nominated him the first Bishop of Jerusalem, and the other Apostles ratified the people’s choice, especially as it was believed that Jesus had designated St. James for this position. The cares of the high office only served to quicken his zeal, and converts were won from Judaism in such numbers, that Annas, the High Priest, determined to put him to death. This Annas was son of the High Priest of the same name, who condemned Jesus, and the Roman Governor being dead, before a new one could be appointed, he, as High Priest, had the Apostle brought before him and sentenced him to be stoned to death. He was led out to the battlements of the Temple, when, stepping forward, he was in the act of making a profession of faith, when the executioners hurled him from one of the lofty pinnacles to the pavement below. Still breathing, St. James raised himself up into a kneeling posture, and while praying aloud for his murderers, one of them, rushing upon him, crushed his skull with a clubbed staff.

St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans (iii. 28) says:—"For we account a man to be justified by "faith without the works of the law;" and in his Epistle to the Galatians (iii. 2), "But that in the "law no man is justified with God it is manifest : "because the just man liveth by faith." The Apostle is here combatting the erroneous doctrine, that the observance of the outward ceremonies enjoined by the Old Law is necessary for one to be accounted righteous in the sight of God. He meets this assumption by an emphatic statement to the effect that faith alone in Jesus Christ justifies, because through it our works are rendered meritorious of eternal life. This declaration of St. Paul to the Romans and Galatians was, however, distorted by the Jewish converts into an argument that it was sufficient in order to be accounted *just* before God in the Church of Christ, to have abstract faith in the Saviour without performing works of any kind. St. James in his Epistle shows this was a false meaning to attach to these words of the great Apostle of the Gentiles, for abstract faith is dead, whereas the true Christian faith is living, being animated by good works:—"Do you see that by works "a man is justified, and not by faith only" (James ii. 24). St. James contended against one dangerous doctrine of the converted Jews, and St. Paul against another, while both advocated the necessity of good works. St. Paul insisted that the works of the

Mosaic dispensation are ineffectual towards justification, because faith in Jesus Christ alone can render our works meritorious of eternal life. St. James in his Epistle teaches that the Christian faith is essentially active, confirmed by good works, and this is exactly the same doctrine as that enunciated by St. Paul from a different standpoint, so that there is no opposition between the teaching of the two Apostles.

THE FIRST AND SECOND EPISTLES OF ST. PETER:—When St. John the Baptist, on the banks of the Jordan, made use in reference to our Blessed Lord of these words:—"Behold the Lamb of God, behold Him who taketh away the sin of the world" (John i. 29), St. Andrew being present, was so deeply impressed that he at once followed Jesus. His brother, Simon, soon joined, and Christ greeted him:—"Thou art Simon the son of Jona, thou shalt be called Cephas, which is interpreted "Peter" (John i. 42). The humble fisherman of Galilee was thus favoured with a prophetic intimation of the exalted position to which he was destined, namely, to be head of the Church of Christ.

The two brothers, though obliged to toil in the Lake of Genesareth, in Upper Galilee, day after day for their support, were now assiduous in their attendance on Him, whom they regarded as the Messias, when one morning Jesus stepping into their boat told Simon and Andrew to row out into

the deep and lower their nets, for He knew they had caught nothing during the night. To their amazement the draught of fish taken was so large that not being able to secure it, they signalled for help to James and John, the sons of Zebedee, who were engaged close by, and the two boats were filled. This miracle was intended to convey to the Apostles the success that would attend their mission of saving souls. For when Simon, overwhelmed with gratitude, fell upon his knees, his Divine Master said to him, "Fear not: from henceforth "thou shalt catch men" (Luke v. 10), and at the same moment, not only Simon and his brother Andrew, but James and John, the sons of Zebedee, were called to the Apostolate. The incident is also related by St. Matthew (iv. 18-22), and by St. Mark (i. 16-20); but it is St. Luke who gives most particulars, adding:—"And having brought their "ships to land, leaving all things, they followed "Him" (St. Luke v. 11). Again at Cesarea Philippi Jesus asked the Apostles, "Whom do you "say that I am?" (Matthew xvi. 15). St. Peter answered, "Thou art Christ, the Son of the living "God" (Matthew xvi. 16), and he was rewarded with the primacy (Matthew xvi. 18, 19), that is the supreme power of governing the whole flock—pastors and people (John xxi. 16, 17).

Our Lord's three years of active ministry had now drawn to a close, when He went up to

Jerusalem to celebrate the Pasch in the Temple. While there, sitting one evening in the midst of His Apostles, He made them sorrowful by announcing the beginning of His Passion for that very night, when His own trusted disciples would turn their backs upon Him. St. Peter, carried away by his feelings and leaning solely upon himself, made this protestation, "Although all shall be scandalized in Thee, yet not I" (Mark xiv. 29). Jesus to teach even one, who was to be the head of His Church, the forcible but wholesome lesson of not relying solely on his own powers, spoke to him thus:—"Amen I say to thee, to-day even in this night, before the cock crow twice, thou shalt deny Me thrice" (Mark xiv. 30), and it happened accordingly. St. Peter, in the full fervour of his resolution, drew his sword that night on the soldiers in the Garden of Gethsemani, and followed his Divine Master even into the house of the High Priest. But while there the servants pointed to him as having connection with one who was charged with being an impostor and blasphemer, and he protested:—"I know not this man of whom you speak" (Mark xiv. 71). St. Peter bewailed this denial ever after, "not from fear of punishment," as St. Chrysostom observes, "but because he denied Him whom he loved" (Homily v. on the Epistle to the Romans).

As soon as the Apostles were filled with the

Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost St. Peter appeared in Jerusalem before an immense multitude, who were celebrating the Jewish Feast, and propounded the truths of the Gospel in language so forcible, that 3,000 begged to be baptized. On a subsequent occasion with St. John he went up to the Temple "at the ninth hour of prayer," and by his preaching made such a deep impression that 6,000 were received into the Church. This success, as well as the active zeal of these Apostles so stirred up the envy and alarm of the Synagogue, that they were arrested by the Sanhedrim, on the charge of sedition, and sent to jail: "But
"an angel of the Lord by night opening the doors
"of the prison, and leading them out said: Go, and
"standing speak in the Temple to the people all the
"words of this life" (Acts v. 19, 20). Early next morning the guard was startled to find the heavy doors rolled back, and the two prisoners in the Temple, teaching the truths of salvation. When asked why they did so in defiance of the law, they answered: "We ought to obey God rather than
"men" (Acts v. 29).

At Joppa, St. Peter had a vision, announcing the Divine will for the admission of the Gentiles into the Church, and immediately he began his new mission by baptizing Cornelius, the centurion, in command of the Roman garrison at Cesarea. From this he went to Antioch, and thence, after seven

years to Rome, which he governed as bishop for twenty-five years, and there shed his blood for the faith in A.D. 67 or 68, being crucified head downwards on the Janiculum.

THE FIRST EPISTLE OF ST. PETER:—It was in Rome, during the persecution of Nero about A.D. 65, that St. Peter wrote his first Epistle to the “Strangers dispersed through Pontas, Galatia, “Cappadocia, Asia, Bithynia.” In it he encourages the converts to brave the severe ordeal through which they were passing, by holding out to them the reward that awaits good and faithful followers of Christ. Some critics think its style is not that of St. Peter; but this is explained by tradition, which represents St. Peter as having supplied the matter to “Sylvanus, a faithful brother unto you, “as I think, I have written briefly” (1st Epistle of St. Peter v. 12).

The Epistle is dated from Babylon, not the capital of Chaldea, which became a by-word among the nations for profligacy, and was destroyed by the Emperor Caligula, before A.D. 41. The Babylon of St. Peter’s first Epistle is Rome, because in it he addressed the Jewish Christians chiefly, and by them *Rome* was commonly referred to as Babylon. Like the prosperous but corrupt capital on the Euphrates, Rome was not more notorious for opulence than for the luxury and licentiousness of her inhabitants. Thus it happened that the great city on

the Tiber is often mentioned as Babylon by St. John in the Apocalypse (xvi. 19; xvii. 5; xviii. 2, etc.); and now that the Jews were groaning under the Roman yoke, they had a special reason for regarding Rome to be to them what Babylon was to their fathers in the days of Nabuchodonosor, the scene of their exile. For these reasons, and also as St. Jerome remarks, to conceal his whereabouts from Nero's myrmidons, St. Peter dated his first Epistle from Babylon.

In *the Second Epistle of St. Peter* (i. 14) these words occur:—"Being assured that the laying away of *this* my tabernacle is at hand." It must have been therefore written not many days before his martyrdom. Hence it is regarded a last exhortation to his sorrowing children in the Church to cherish the inestimable gift of faith, in order to be prepared for the terrible judgment to come:—"But the day of the Lord shall come as a thief in which the heavens shall pass away with great violence, and the elements shall be melted with heat, and the earth and the works that are in it shall be burnt up" (2nd Epistle of St. Peter iii. 10).

FIRST, SECOND, AND THIRD EPISTLES OF ST. JOHN:—St. John the Evangelist is the writer of three of the Catholic Epistles, and in them he earnestly implores the faithful to make their lives worthy of Jesus Christ, whose Divinity and Incarnation he had just set forth in his Gospel.

These doctrines he repeats in his *Epistles*, with all the weight of his authority, in order that faith in our Blessed Lord may bear good and abundant fruit. The second of these Epistles, though intended for the whole Church, was addressed to a pious lady, and the third was forwarded to his “dearly beloved Gaius,” a convert of high standing, who opened his purse freely to relieve the distress of his poorer brethren.

That St. John is the writer of these Epistles there can be no doubt from their phraseology, which is the same as that of the fourth Gospel. Moreover there is the statement:—“That which “was from the beginning, which we have heard, “which we have seen with our eyes, which we “have looked upon, and our hands have handled of “the word of life” (1st Epistle of St. John i. 1), and this exactly corresponds with the character of St. John the Evangelist.

THE EPISTLE OF ST. JUDE:—The writer of the last of the seven Catholic Epistles is St. Jude, or Thaddeus, for it begins thus:—“Jude, the servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James.” Like St. Peter’s second Epistle, it warns the faithful against the errors of certain heretics, who were every day becoming more aggressive. It also inculcates the necessity of good works, a doctrine which was denied by the false teachers, against whom St. Jude was contending.

PRINTED BY SEALY, BRYERS AND WALKER, MIDDLE ABBEY STREET, DUBLIN





BS
475
.M13

